AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 144 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JUNE 5, 1998 *No. 72*

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 5, 1998.

I hereby designate the Honorable JOEL HEFLEY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Reverend James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer: We place before You, gracious God, the emotions that stir our hearts, awaken our minds and revive our energies. As You have breathed into our souls the very breath of life, so may we gain new energy and refreshment from our prayers of praise and thanksgiving. May our communication with Your spirit, O God, give meaning and purpose to what we do, even as we use the gifts You have given in ways that honor You and serve people wherever they may live or whatever their need.

We pray a special blessing this day on our pages who have served this body with enthusiasm and dedication and who now leave for new responsibilities. May Your benediction, O God, be with them, and grant them all good gifts, now and evermore, Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GIBBONS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 102. Concurrent resolution recognizing Disabled American Veterans.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will recognize one-minute requests at the end of legislative business today.

USER FEE ACT OF 1998

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of June 4, 1998, I call up the bill (H.R. 3989) to provide for the enactment of user fees proposed by the President in his budget submission under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, for fiscal year 1999, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill is considered read for amendment and the amendment made in order, pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, June 4, 1998, is adopted.

The text of H.R. 3989, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 3989

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''User Fee Act of 1998''.

TITLE I—FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION FEES

SEC. 101. REFERENCES IN THIS TITLE.

Whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, a repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

PART A—USER FEES

SEC. 111. FEES RELATED TO FOOD ADDITIVE PETITIONS.

(a) TYPES OF FEES.—Beginning in fiscal year 1999, the Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this title as the ''Secretary'') shall establish, in accordance with section 121, fees to cover activities of the Food and Drug Administration in connection with—

(1) petitions for food additives submitted pursuant to section 409(b) (21 U.S.C. 438(b));

(2) notifications to the Secretary for food contact substances submitted pursuant to section 409(h) (21 U.S.C. 438(h));

(3) petitions for color additives submitted pursuant to section 721 (21 U.S.C. 379e);

(4) petitions, submitted pursuant to sections 201(s), and 701(a) (21 U.S.C. 321(s), 371(a)) and regulations thereunder, for affirmation that a substance that becomes, or may reasonably be expected to become, a component of food is generally recognized as safe; and

(5) notifications to the Secretary, submitted pursuant to sections 201(s) and 701(a) and regulations thereunder asserting that a substance that becomes, or may reasonably be expected to become, a component of food is generally recognized as safe.

The fees shall be payable at the time the petition or notification is submitted to the Secretary.

(b) FEE AMOUNTS AND AVAILABILITY.—Subject to section 121(a)(1)(A), fees for the activities specified in subsection (a) shall be set for each fiscal year at amounts that the Secretary reasonably estimates to be sufficient to generate revenues totaling $10,335,000 for each of fiscal years 1999

☐ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., ☐ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

through 2003, and shall remain available until expended, to the extent provided in appropriations Acts, for the costs of carrying out such activities.

SEC. 112. FEES RELATED TO GENERIC DRUGS.

(a) TYPES OF FEES.—Beginning in fiscal year 1999, the Secretary shall establish, in accordance with section 121, fees to cover activities of the Food and Drug Administration in connection with applications for approval for new drugs submitted pursuant to section 505(j) (21 U.S.C. 355). The fees shall be payable at the time the application for approval is submitted to the Secretary.

(b) FEE AMOUNTS AND AVAILABILITY.—Subject to section 121(a)(1)(A), fees for the activities specified in subsection (a) shall be set for each fiscal year at amounts that the Secretary reasonably estimates to be sufficient to generate revenues totaling $12,377,000 for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2003, and shall remain available until expended, to the extent provided in appropriations Acts, for the costs of carrying out such activities.

SEC. 113. FEES RELATED TO ANIMAL DRUGS.

(a) TYPES OF FEES.—Beginning in fiscal year 1999, the Secretary shall establish, in accordance with section 121, fees to cover activities of the Food and Drug Administration in connection with—

(1) applications, including supplements, for new animal drugs submitted pursuant to section 512(b)(1) (21 U.S.C. 360b(b)(1), including application and other submissions for import tolerances, as described in section 512(a)(6) (21 U.S.C. 360b(a)(b));

(2) abbreviated applications, including supplements, for new animal drugs submitted pursuant to section 512(b)(2) (21 U.S.C. 360b(b)(2)); and

(3) applications for licenses to manufacture animal feeds bearing or containing new animal drugs, submitted pursuant to section 512(m) (21 U.S.C. 360b(m)).

The fees shall be payable at the time the application for approval is submitted to the Secretary.

(b) FEE AMOUNTS AND AVAILABILITY.—Subject to section 121(a)(1)(A), fees for the activities specified in subsection (a) shall be set for each fiscal year at amounts that the Secretary reasonably estimates to be sufficient to generate revenues totaling $10,100,000 for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2003, and shall remain available until expended, to the extent provided in appropriations Acts, for the costs of carrying out such activities.

SEC. 114. FEES RELATED TO MEDICAL DEVICES.

(a) TYPES OF FEES.—Beginning in fiscal year 1999, the Secretary shall establish, in accordance with section 121, fees to cover activities of the Food and Drug Administration in connection with applications for—

(1) premarket approval of devices (including proposed product development protocols) submitted under section 515 (21 U.S.C. 360e);

(2) supplements to approved premarket approval applications for which clinical data are required;

(3) supplements to approved premarket approval applications for which clinical data are not required; and

(4) device premarket notification submissions under section 510(k) (21 U.S.C. 360(k)).

The fees shall be payable at the time the application is submitted to the Secretary.

(b) FEE AMOUNTS.—The fees required under subsection (a) shall be as follows:

(1) $175,000 for applications described in subsection (a)(1).

(2) $100,000 for supplements described in subsection (a)(2).

(3) $6,000 for supplements described in subsection (a)(3).

(4) $4,500 for submissions described in subsection (a)(4).

(c) FEE AMOUNTS AND AVAILABILITY.—Subject to section 121(a)(1)(A), fees for the activities specified in subsection (a) shall be set each fiscal year in accordance with section 121 to amounts that the Secretary reasonably estimates to be sufficient to generate revenues totaling $25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2003, and shall remain available until expended, to the extent provided in appropriations Acts, for the costs of carrying out such activities.

SEC. 115. FEES RELATED TO IMPORT INSPECTIONS AND EXPORT CERTIFICATES.

(a) TYPES OF FEES.—Beginning in fiscal year 1999, the Secretary shall establish, in accordance with section 121, fees to cover activities of the Food and Drug Administration in connection with the review of imported human and animal drugs, medical devices, and food subject to regulation under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (including activities relating to admission or detention of, refusal of entry to, and the issuance of export certificates for such items). The fees shall be payable at the time of each import entry or request for export certificates for shipment of the item.

(b) FEE AMOUNTS AND AVAILABILITY.—Subject to section 121(a)(1)(A), fees for the activities specified in subsection (a) shall be set for each fiscal year at amounts that the Secretary reasonably estimates to be sufficient to generate revenues totaling $12,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2003, and shall remain available until expended, to the extent provided in appropriations Acts, for the costs of carrying out such activities.

(c) COLLECTIONS.—The fees authorized by this section shall be collected on behalf of the Secretary by the United States Customs Service.

SEC. 116. FEES RELATED TO ENTITIES UNDER FDA'S OVERSIGHT.

(a) TYPES OF FEES.—Beginning in fiscal year 1999, the Secretary shall establish, in accordance with section 121, fees to cover activities of the Food and Drug Administration in connection with regulatory activities with respect to regulated products approved for marketing. The Secretary shall assess fees for monitoring establishments that are subject to regulation (including inspections conducted pursuant to section 704 (21 U.S.C. 374), and other regulatory activities), as follows:

(1) FOOD ESTABLISHMENTS.—An establishment subject to inspection under section 704 (21 U.S.C. 374) because it manufactures, processes, packs, or holds food for (or after) shipment in interstate commerce, is subject to assessment of annual fees under this section. The Secretary may impose an annual registration requirement on such an establishment to facilitate assessment and collection of the fees.

(2) DRUG AND DEVICE ESTABLISHMENTS.—An establishment subject to the annual registration requirement under section 510 (21 U.S.C. 360) (with respect to products other than those for which such an establishment is subject to section 736 (21 U.S.C. 379h) is subject to assessment of annual fees under this section at the time of registration.

(3) COSMETIC ESTABLISHMENTS.—An establishment subject to inspection under section 704 (21 U.S.C. 374) because it manufactures, processes, packs, or holds cosmetics for (or after) shipment in interstate commerce is subject to assessment of annual fees under this section. The Secretary may impose an annual registration requirement on such an establishment to facilitate assessment and collection of the fees.

This section does not affect any other statutory or regulatory requirements imposed on these entities.

(b) FEE AMOUNTS AND AVAILABILITY.—Subject to section 121(a)(1)(A), fees for the activities specified in subsection (a) shall be set for each fiscal year at amounts that the Secretary reasonably estimates to be sufficient to generate revenues totaling $57,905,000 for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2003, and shall remain available until expended, to the extent provided in appropriations Acts, for the costs of carrying out such activities.

PART B—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 121. GENERAL PROVISIONS RELATED TO USER FEES.

(a) ASSESSMENT OF FEES.—

(1) FEE AMOUNTS.—

(A) COLLECTIONS SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATIONS.—The fees authorized by this Act shall be collected in each fiscal year as provided in appropriation Acts for such fiscal year.

(B) RELATION TO COSTS.—Fees assessed and collected under part A shall not exceed amounts which the Secretary estimates to be sufficient to cover costs of the Food and Drug Administration associated with the activities for which the fees are collected (including costs of assessments and collection of the fees).

(C) VARIATION FACTORS.—The amount of fees established may vary to reflect the cost of those activities with respect to different entities or groups of entities, including the type and size of entity, volume of business, and other factors the Secretary may find appropriate.

(2) FEE DETERMINATION AND PUBLICATION.—The Secretary shall annually establish fee amounts under part A, and shall publish schedules of such fees in the Federal Register as an interim final rule. The establishment and publication of such fees shall be solely in the discretion of the Secretary and shall not be subject to the requirements of sections 553 and 801 of title 5 of the United States Code and shall not be reviewable.

(3) REDUCTION OR WAIVER OF FEES.—The Secretary may provide for reduction or waiver of the fees under part A in exceptional circumstances in the public interest.

(b) CREDITING AND AVAILABILITY OF FEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Fees collected pursuant to part A shall be credited to a special fund in the Treasury for user fees collected by the Food and Drug Administration. The fees shall be available in the amounts specified in appropriations Acts, for salaries and expenses necessary to carry out the responsibilities of the Food and Drug Administration in connection with the activities for which such fees were collected, including the conduct of scientific research, development of methods of analysis, purchase of chemicals, fixtures, furniture, and scientific equipment and apparatus, development and acquisition of information technology and information management systems, acquisition, maintenance, and repair of real property, and expenses of advisory committees.

(2) FEES AVAILABLE ONLY FOR THE CATEGORY OF ACTIVITY FOR WHICH ASSESSED.—Fees collected for each category of activities specified in part A shall be separately accounted for, and shall be used only to finance the costs related to carrying out responsibilities in connection with the same category of activities for which the fees were collected.

(c) COLLECTION OF UNPAID FEES.—If the Secretary does not receive payment of a fee assessed under subsection (a) within 30 days after it is due, that fee shall be treated as a claim of the United States Government subject to the provisions of subchapter II of chapter 37 of title 31 of the United States Code.

SEC. 122. AGENCY PLAN AND ANNUAL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

The agency plan for the Food and Drug Administration required under section 903(f) (21

U.S.C. 393(f)) shall include objectives with respect to the assessment, collection, and use of the fees authorized under part A, and the annual report required by section 903(g) (21 U.S.C. (g)) shall describe the performance of the Secretary with respect to such objectives.

TITLE II—MEDICARE ADMINISTRATIVE FEES

SEC. 201. COLLECTION OF FEES FROM MEDICARE+CHOICE ORGANIZATIONS FOR CONTRACT INITIATION AND RENEWAL.

Section 1857 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–27) is amended by adding after subsection (h) the following new subsection:

''(i) FEES FOR CONTRACT ISSUANCE AND RENEWAL AND ONGOING MONITORING.—

''(1) AUTHORITY TO IMPOSE FEES.—The Secretary shall impose, to the extent provided in appropriation Acts—

''(A) fees for initial Medicare+Choice contracts under this part; and

''(B) annual fees for renewal of such contracts and monitoring of the ongoing operations of Medicare+Choice organizations.

''(2) ASSESSMENT OF FEES.—

''(A) TYPES OF FEES.—

''(i) INITIATION FEES.—Fee amounts assessed against a member of a class of organizations pursuant to paragraph (1)(A) shall not exceed the Secretary's reasonable estimate of the average cost of initiating a Medicare+Choice contract for an organization in such class.

''(ii) RENEWAL AND MONITORING FEES.—Fee amounts assessed pursuant to paragraph (1)(B) against members of a class of organizations shall not exceed the amount which the Secretary reasonably estimates will generate total revenues sufficient to cover total annual costs for renewing contracts and performing ongoing monitoring with respect to such class.

''(B) FEE DETERMINATION AND PUBLICATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall annually establish fee amounts under this subsection, and shall annually publish schedules of such fees in the Federal Register. The establishment and publication of such fees shall be solely in the discretion of the Secretary and shall not be subject to the requirements of sections 553 and 801 of title 5, United States Code, and shall not be reviewable. Previously published fee schedules shall remain in effect until new schedules are effective.

''(ii) REDUCTION OR WAIVER OF FEES.—The Secretary may provide for reduction or waiver of the fees under this subsection in exceptional circumstances in the public interest.

''(3) COLLECTION AND CREDITING OF FEES.—

''(A) INITIAL FEES.—Fees assessed against an organization pursuant to paragraph (1)(A) shall be payable upon submission of the application to participate in the program under this title as a Medicare+Choice organization (and shall apply whether or not the Secretary approves such application) and shall be credited to the Health Care Financing Administration Program Management Account.

''(B) RENEWAL AND MONITORING FEES.—Fees assessed against an organization pursuant to paragraph (1)(B) shall be payable annually and may be deducted from amounts otherwise payable from a Trust Fund under this title to such organization. Such fees shall be credited to the Health Care Financing Administration Program Management Account.

''(C) OFFSET.—Any amount of fees collected in a fiscal year under this subsection that exceeds the amount of such fees available for expenditure in such fiscal year, as specified in appropriation Acts, shall be credited to the Health Care Financing Administration Program Management Account, and shall be available for obligation in subsequent fiscal years to the extent provided in subsequent appropriations Acts.

''(4) AVAILABILITY OF FEES.—Fees collected pursuant to this subsection shall remain available until expended, in the amounts provided in appropriation Acts, for the costs of the activities for which they were assessed.''.

SEC. 202. FEES FOR SURVEY AND CERTIFICATION.

Section 1864(e) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395aa(e)) is amended to read as follows:

''(e) FEES FOR CONDUCTING CERTIFICATION SURVEYS.—

''(1) AUTHORITY TO IMPOSE FEES.—Except as provided in paragraph (6), to the extent provided in appropriation Acts, the Secretary shall impose, or require States as a condition of agreements under this section to impose—

''(A) fees for surveys for the purpose of making initial determinations as to whether entities meet requirements under this title; and

''(B) annual fees to cover the costs of periodic surveys to determine whether entities participating in the program under this title continue to meet such requirements.

''(2) ASSESSMENT OF FEES.—

''(A) TYPES OF FEES.—

''(i) FEES FOR INITIAL SURVEYS.—Fee amounts assessed pursuant to paragraph (1)(A) against an entity in a class and State shall not exceed the estimated average cost of an initial survey and determination for an entity in such class and State.

''(ii) FEES FOR RECERTIFICATION SURVEYS.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—Fee amounts assessed pursuant to paragraph (1)(B) against entities in a class in a State shall not exceed the amount which the Secretary reasonably estimates will generate total revenues sufficient to cover the applicable percentage specified in subclause (II) of total annual costs for such surveys and determinations with respect to such class and State.

''(II) APPLICABLE PERCENTAGES.—For purposes of subclause (I), the applicable percentage specified in this subclause is—

''(aa) 33 percent for fiscal year 1999;

''(bb) 66 percent for fiscal year 2000; and

''(cc) 100 percent for fiscal year 2001 and each succeeding fiscal year.

''(B) FEE DETERMINATION AND PUBLICATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall annually establish fee amounts under this subsection, and shall annually publish schedules of such fees in the Federal Register. The establishment and publication of such fees shall be solely in the discretion of the Secretary and shall not be subject to the requirements of sections 553 and 801 of title 5, United States Code, and shall not be reviewable. Previously published fee schedules shall remain in effect until new schedules are effective.

''(ii) REDUCTION OR WAIVER OF FEES.—The Secretary may provide for reduction or waiver of the fees under this subsection in exceptional circumstances in the public interest.

''(3) COLLECTION AND CREDITING OF FEES.—

''(A) FEES FOR INITIAL SURVEYS.—

''(i) COLLECTION OF FEES.—Fees assessed against an entity in a State pursuant to paragraph (1)(A) shall be payable at the time of the initial survey to the Secretary (or, in the case of surveys performed by a State agency, to such agency).

''(ii) REMITTANCE OF FEE AMOUNT TO SECRETARY WHERE STATE COLLECTS FEES.—In the event a State agency collects a fee pursuant to clause (i), such agency shall remit to the Secretary an amount equal to the Secretary's share of the cost of the activities described in paragraph (1)(A).

''(iii) CREDITING OF FEES.—Fees paid to the Secretary pursuant to clause (i) or remitted to the Secretary pursuant to clause (ii) shall be credited to the Health Care Financing Administration Program Management Account.

''(B) FEES FOR RECERTIFICATION SURVEYS.—

''(i) COLLECTION OF FEES.—Fees assessed against an entity pursuant to paragraph (1)(B) shall be payable annually and may be deducted from amounts otherwise payable from a Trust Fund under this title to such entity.

''(ii) REIMBURSEMENT OF STATE AGENCY COSTS.—Of amounts collected pursuant to clause (i), an amount equal to the State's share of the cost of activities described in paragraph (1)(B) shall be transferred to the appropriate State agency.

''(iii) REIMBURSEMENT OF SECRETARY'S COSTS.—The balance of the amount collected pursuant to clause (i) that is not paid to a State agency pursuant to clause (ii) shall be credited to the Health Care Financing Administration Program Management Account.

''(C) OFFSET.—Any amount of fees collected in a fiscal year under this subsection that exceeds the amount of such fees available for expenditure in such fiscal year, as specified in appropriation Acts, shall be credited to the Health Care Financing Administration Program Management Account, and shall be available for obligation in subsequent fiscal years to the extent provided in subsequent appropriations Acts.

''(4) AVAILABILITY OF FEES.—Fees collected pursuant to this subsection shall remain available until expended, in the amounts provided in appropriation Acts, for necessary expenses related to the purposes for which the fees were assessed.

''(5) TREATMENT OF FEES FOR PURPOSES OF COST REPORTS.—An entity may not include a fee assessed pursuant to this subsection as an allowable item on a cost report under this title or title XIX.

''(6) CERTAIN ENTITIES NOT SUBJECT TO FEE.—The Secretary shall not impose fees under this subsection against entities subject to the requirements of the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments of 1988.''.

SEC. 203. FEES FOR REGISTRATION OF INDIVIDUALS AND ENTITIES PROVIDING HEALTH CARE ITEMS OR SERVICES UNDER MEDICARE.

Section 1866 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395cc) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by adding ''AND REGISTRATION OF OTHER PERSONS FURNISHING SERVICES'' after ''PROVIDERS OF SERVICES''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(j) REGISTRATION PROCEDURES AND FEES.—

''(1) REGISTRATION.—The Secretary shall establish a procedure for initial registration and periodic renewal of registration of individuals and entities that furnish items or services for which payment may be made under this title and that are not otherwise subject to provisions of this title providing for such procedures.

''(2) FEES.—

''(A) AUTHORITY TO IMPOSE FEES.—The Secretary shall impose, to the extent provided in appropriation Acts—

''(i) fees for initial agreements with providers of services and initial registrations of other entities and individuals that furnish items or services for which payment may be made under this title, and

''(ii) annual fees to cover the costs of renewals of agreements and registrations of such individuals and entities.

''(B) ASSESSMENT OF FEES.—

''(i) TYPES OF FEES.—

''(I) INITIAL FEES.—Fee amounts assessed pursuant to subparagraph (A)(i) against a member of a class of individuals or entities shall not exceed the Secretary's reasonable estimate of the average cost of initiating an agreement or performing an initial registration for an individual or entity in such class.

''(II) RENEWAL FEES.—Fee amounts assessed pursuant to subparagraph (A)(ii) against members of a class of individuals or entities shall not exceed the amount which the Secretary reasonably estimates will generate total revenues sufficient to cover total annual costs of performing such renewals with respect to such class.

''(ii) FEE DETERMINATION AND PUBLICATION.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall annually establish fee amounts under this paragraph, and shall annually publish schedules of such fees in the Federal Register. The establishment and publication of such fees shall be solely in the discretion of the Secretary and shall not be subject to the requirements of sections 553 and 801 of title 5, United States Code, and shall not be reviewable. Previously published fee schedules shall remain in effect until new schedules are effective.

''(II) REDUCTION OR WAIVER OF FEES.—The Secretary may provide for reduction or waiver of the fees under this paragraph in exceptional circumstances in the public interest.

''(C) COLLECTION AND CREDITING OF FEES.—

''(i) INITIAL FEES.—Fees assessed pursuant to subparagraph (A)(i) against an individual or entity shall be payable upon application for billing privileges under the program under this title (and shall apply whether or not the Secretary approves such application) and shall be credited to the Health Care Financing Administration Program Management Account.

''(ii) RENEWAL FEES.—Fees assessed pursuant to subparagraph (A)(ii) against an individual or entity shall be payable annually and may be deducted from amounts otherwise payable from a Trust Fund under this title to such individual or entity. Such fees shall be credited to the Health Care Financing Administration Program Management Account.

''(iii) OFFSET.—Any amount of fees collected in a fiscal year under this paragraph that exceeds the amount of such fees available for expenditure in such fiscal year, as specified in appropriation Acts, shall be credited to the Health Care Financing Administration Program Management Account, and shall be available for obligation in subsequent fiscal years to the extent provided in subsequent appropriations Acts.

''(D) AVAILABILITY OF FEES.—Fees collected pursuant to this paragraph shall remain available until expended, in the amounts provided in appropriation Acts, for necessary expenses related to initiating and renewing such agreements and registrations, including costs of—

''(i) establishing and maintaining procedures and records systems;

''(ii) processing applications;

''(iii) background investigations;

''(iv) renewal of billing privileges; and

''(v) reverification of eligibility.

''(E) TREATMENT OF FEES FOR PURPOSES OF COST REPORTS.—An entity may not include a fee assessed pursuant to this paragraph as an allowable item on a cost report under this title or title XIX.''.

SEC. 204. FEES TO COVER THE COST OF MEDICARE DESK REVIEW, AUDIT, AND COST SETTLEMENT ACTIVITIES.

Section 1893 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ddd) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) FEES FOR REVIEW, AUDIT, AND COST SETTLEMENT ACTIVITIES.—

''(1) AUTHORITY TO IMPOSE FEES.—The Secretary shall impose fees on providers of services and other entities furnishing items or services for which payment may be made under this title for performance of review, audit, and cost settlement activities in connection with the audit of cost reports under subsection (b)(2).

''(2) ASSESSMENT OF FEES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Fee amounts assessed pursuant to paragraph (1) against members of a class of entities shall not exceed the amount which the Secretary reasonably estimates will generate total revenues sufficient to cover total annual costs for performing such activities with respect to such class.

''(B) FEE DETERMINATION AND PUBLICATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall annually establish fee amounts under this subsection, and shall annually publish schedules of such fees in the Federal Register. The establishment and publication of such fees shall be solely in the discretion of the Secretary and shall not be subject to the requirements of sections 553 and 801 of title 5, United States Code, and shall not be reviewable. Previously published fee schedules shall remain in effect until new schedules are effective.

''(ii) REDUCTION OR WAIVER OF FEES.—The Secretary may provide for reduction or waiver of the fees under this subsection in exceptional circumstances in the public interest.

''(3) COLLECTION, CREDITING, AND AVAILABILITY OF FEES.—Fees assessed pursuant to paragraph (1) against an entity shall be payable annually and may be deducted from amounts otherwise payable from a Trust Fund under this title to such entity. Such fees shall be credited to the Health Care Fraud and Abuse Control Account. Fees collected pursuant to this subsection shall remain available until expended, for necessary expenses for the purposes for which the fees were assessed.

''(4) TREATMENT OF FEES FOR PURPOSES OF COST REPORTS.—An entity may not include a fee assessed pursuant to this subsection as an allowable item on a cost report under this title or title XIX.''.

SEC. 205. FEES FOR PROCESSING CLAIMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 1897. FEES FOR PROCESSING CLAIMS.

''(a) AUTHORITY TO IMPOSE FEES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), each claim described in paragraph (2) submitted by an individual or entity furnishing items or services for which payment may be made under this title is subject to a processing fee of $1.00.

''(2) CLAIMS SUBJECT TO FEE.—A claim is subject to the fee specified in paragraph (1) if it—

''(A) duplicates, in whole or in part, another claim submitted by the same individual or entity;

''(B) is a claim that cannot be processed and must, in accordance with the Secretary's instructions, be returned by the fiscal intermediary or carrier to the individual or entity for completion; or

''(C) is not submitted electronically by an individual or entity or the authorized billing agent of such individual or entity.

''(b) COLLECTION, CREDITING, AND AVAILABILITY OF FEES.—

''(1) APPROPRIATIONS REQUIRED.—Fees shall be collected and expended under this section to the extent provided in appropriation Acts.

''(2) DEDUCTION FROM TRUST FUND.—The Secretary shall deduct any fees assessed pursuant to subsection (a) against an individual or entity from amounts otherwise payable from a Trust Fund under this title to such individual or entity, and shall transfer the amount so deducted from such Trust Fund to the Health Care Financing Administration Program Management Account.

''(3) OFFSET.—Any amount of fees collected in a fiscal year under this section that exceeds the amount of such fees available for expenditure in such fiscal year, as specified in appropriation Acts, shall be credited to the Health Care Financing Administration Program Management Account, and shall be available for obligation in subsequent fiscal years to the extent provided in subsequent appropriations Acts.

''(4) AVAILABILITY.—Fees collected pursuant to this section shall remain available until expended for the costs of the activities for which they were assessed.

''(c) WAIVER OF CERTAIN FEES.—The Secretary may provide for waiver of fees for claims described in subsection (a)(2)(C) in cases of such compelling circumstances as the Secretary may determine.

''(d) TREATMENT OF FEES FOR PURPOSES OF COST REPORTS.—An entity may not include a fee assessed pursuant to this section as an allowable item on a cost report under this title or title XIX.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1842(c)(4) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395u(c)(4)) is amended by striking ''Neither a carrier'' and inserting ''Except as provided in section 1897, neither a carrier''.

SEC. 206. SECRETARY'S AUTHORITY TO ISSUE INTERIM FINAL REGULATIONS.

The Secretary of Health and Human Services is authorized to issue any regulations needed to implement the amendments made by this title as interim final regulations.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS USER FEES

SEC. 301. AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE TO IMPOSE USER FEES FOR CERTAIN SERVICES PROVIDED BY DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AGENCIES.

The Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 is amended by inserting after section 219 (7 U.S.C. 6919) the following new section:

''SEC. 220. USER FEES FOR CERTAIN SERVICES PROVIDED BY DEPARTMENT AGENCIES, OFFICES, OFFICERS, AND EMPLOYEES.

''(a) USER FEES AUTHORIZED.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may prescribe and collect fees sufficient to cover all or some portion of the cost to the Department, including administrative costs, of providing services under the laws specified in subsection (b).

''(b) COVERED LAWS.—Subsection (a) applies to the following laws, notwithstanding any provision prohibiting the imposition of user fees in any such law:

''(1) Laws administered by the Animal and Plant Inspection Service (or any successor agency), including the following specific services:

''(A) Biotechnology testing services under the Federal Plant Pest Act (7 U.S.C. 150aa et seq.).

''(B) Biotechnology testing services under the Act of August 20, 1912 (commonly known as the Plant Quarantine Act; 7 U.S.C. 151 et seq.).

''(C) Animal welfare licensing services under the Animal Welfare Act (7 U.S.C. 2131 et seq).

''(D) Veterinary biologics services under the Act of March 4, 1913 (commonly known as the Virus-Serum-Toxin Act; 21 U.S.C. 151 et seq.).

''(E) Services under the Swine Health Protection Act (7 U.S.C. 3801 et seq.).

''(2) Laws administered by the Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration (or any successor agency), including the following:

''(A) The Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921 (7 U.S.C. 181 et seq.).

''(B) The United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 71 et seq.).

''(3) Laws administered by the Food Safety and Inspection Service (or any successor agency), including the following:

''(A) The Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 601 et seq.).

''(B) The Poultry Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 451 et seq.).

''(C) The Egg Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 1031 et seq.).

''(4) Laws administered by the Natural Resources Conservation Service (or any successor agency), including authorities regarding the provision of technical assistance and products for natural resource conservation.

''(5) Laws administered by the Farm Service Agency (or any successor agency), including the authorities regarding the provision of information obtained from information collections from persons participating in the programs administered by the Agency.

''(c) EXCEPTIONS.—Subsection (b) does not include any law or service for which a user fee is specifically required or authorized under another provision of law.

''(d) LATE PAYMENT PENALTIES.—If a person subject to a fee under this section fails to pay the fee when due, the Secretary may assess a late payment penalty, and the overdue fees shall accrue interest, as required by section 3717 of title 31, United States Code.

''(e) TREATMENT OF FEES.—Fees and other amounts collected under this section shall be credited to the Department accounts that incur the costs associated with the provision of the services for which the fees are imposed. Funds so credited shall be merged with the appropriations to which credited and shall be available to the Secretary without fiscal year limitation for the same purposes as the appropriations with which merged.''.

SEC. 302. NOAA NAVIGATION ASSISTANCE FEES.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND COLLECTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For fiscal year 1999 and each fiscal year thereafter, the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, shall establish, assess, and collect under section 9701 of title 31, United States Code, fees for the provision of navigation assistance services.

(2) FEE SCHEDULE.—The Secretary shall implement fees under this section by establishment of a schedule for such fees. The Secretary shall publish an interim final rule containing an initial fee schedule not later than 150 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) CREDITING OF FEES.—Fees collected under this section shall be credited as offsetting collections of the Department of Commerce.

(c) AVAILABILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Of amounts of offsetting collections credited for fees under this section—

(A) not to exceed $2,500,000 shall be available to the Secretary of Commerce for fiscal year 1999 for expenses of providing services for which the fees are collected; and

(B) amounts in excess of $2,500,000 shall be available to the Secretary of Commerce for fiscal years after fiscal year 1999 for expenses of providing those services.

(2) AVAILABLE UNTIL EXPENDED.—Amounts available under this section shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 303. FISHERIES MANAGEMENT AND ENFORCEMENT FEES.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND COLLECTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For fiscal year 1999 and each fiscal year thereafter, the Secretary of Commerce shall establish, assess, and collect under section 9701 of title 31, United States Code, fees for the provision of fisheries management and enforcement services.

(2) MANNER OF COLLECTION.—The Secretary may prescribe the manner in which such fees are collected.

(b) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—The maximum amount of any fee under this section may not exceed one percent of the ex-vessel value of harvested fish with respect to which the fee is collected.

(c) CREDITING OF FEES.—Fees collected under this section shall be credited as offsetting collections of the Department of Commerce.

(d) AVAILABILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Of amounts of offsetting collections credited for fees under this section—

(A) not to exceed $19,781,000 shall be available to the Secretary of Commerce for fiscal year 1999 for expenses of providing services for which the fees are collected; and

(B) amounts in excess of $19,781,000 shall be available to the Secretary of Commerce for fiscal years after fiscal year 1999 for expenses of providing those services.

(2) AVAILABLE UNTIL EXPENDED.—Amounts available under this section shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 304. LEVEL OF FEES FOR PATENT SERVICES.

(a) GENERAL PATENT FEES.—Section 41 of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

''(a) The Commissioner shall charge the following fees:

''(1)(A) On filing each application for an original patent, except in design or plant cases, $790.

''(B) In addition, on filing or on presentation at any other time, $82 for each claim in independent form which is in excess of 3, $22 for each claim (whether independent or dependent) which is in excess of 20, and $270 for each application containing a multiple dependent claim.

''(C) On filing each provisional application for an original patent, $150.

''(2) For issuing each original or reissue patent, except in design or plant cases, $1,320.

''(3) In design and plant cases—

''(A) on filing each design application, $330;

''(B) on filing each plant application, $540;

''(C) on issuing each design patent, $450; and

''(D) on issuing each plant patent, $670.

''(4)(A) On filing each application for the reissue of a patent, $790.

''(B) In addition, on filing or on presentation at any other time, $82 for each claim in independent form which is in excess of the number of independent claims of the original patent, and $22 for each claim (whether independent or dependent) which is in excess of 20 and also in excess of the number of claims of the original patent.

''(5) On filing each disclaimer, $110.

''(6)(A) On filing an appeal from the examiner to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, $310.

''(B) In addition, on filing a brief in support of the appeal, $310, and on requesting an oral hearing in the appeal before the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, $270.

''(7) On filing each petition for the revival of an unintentionally abandoned application for a patent or for the unintentionally delayed payment of the fee for issuing each patent, $1,320, unless the petition is filed under section 133 or 151 of this title, in which case the fee shall be $110.

''(8) For petitions for 1-month extensions of time to take actions required by the Commissioner in an application—

''(A) on filing a first petition, $110;

''(B) on filing a second petition, $290; and

''(C) on filing a third petition or subsequent petition, $550.

''(9) Basic national fee for an international application where the Patent and Trademark Office was the International Preliminary Examining Authority and the International Searching Authority, $720.

''(10) Basic national fee for an international application where the Patent and Trademark Office was the International Searching Authority but not the International Preliminary Examining Authority, $790.

''(11) Basic national fee for an international application where the Patent and Trademark Office was neither the International Searching Authority nor the International Preliminary Examining Authority, $1,070.

''(12) Basic national fee for an international application where the international preliminary examination fee has been paid to the Patent and Trademark Office, and the international preliminary examination report states that the provisions of Article 33 (2), (3), and (4) of the Patent Cooperation Treaty have been satisfied for all claims in the application entering the national stage, $98.

''(13) For filing or later presentation of each independent claim in the national stage of an international application in excess of 3, $82.

''(14) For filing or later presentation of each claim (whether independent or dependent) in a national stage of an international application in excess of 20, $22.

''(15) For each national stage of an international application containing a multiple dependent claim, $270.

For the purpose of computing fees, a multiple dependent claim referred to in section 112 of this title or any claim depending therefrom shall be considered as separate dependent claims in accordance with the number of claims to which reference is made. Errors in payment of the additional fees may be rectified in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner.''.

(b) PATENT MAINTENANCE FEES.—Section 41 of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

''(b) The Commissioner shall charge the following fees for maintaining in force all patents based on applications filed on or after December 12, 1980:

''(1) 3 years and 6 months after grant, $1,050.

''(2) 7 years and 6 months after grant, $2,100.

''(3) 11 years and 6 months after grant, $3,160.

Unless payment of the applicable maintenance fee is received in the Patent and Trademark Office on or before the date the fee is due or within a grace period of 6 months thereafter, the patent will expire as of the end of such grace period. The Commissioner may require the payment of a surcharge as a condition of accepting within such 6-month grace period the payment of an applicable maintenance fee. No fee may be established for maintaining a design or plant patent in force.''.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF COLLECTION AND EXPENDITURE.—Section 42(c) of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking the first sentence and inserting the following: ''To the extent and in the amounts provided in advance in appropriations Acts, fees authorized in this title or any other Act to be charged or established by the Commissioner shall be collected by and shall be available to the Commissioner to carry out the activities of the Patent and Trademark Office.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section and the amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 1998.

SEC. 305. EXPORT PROMOTION FEES.

There is authorized to be appropriated to the International Trade Administration of the Department of Commerce $292,452,000, to remain available until expended, of which $6,000,000 shall be derived from fees to be collected and used, to the extent provided in appropriation Acts, by the International Trade Administration for the provision of export promotion services, notwithstanding section 3302 of title 31, United States Code. Any such fees received in excess of $6,000,000 in fiscal year 1999 shall remain available until expended, but shall not be made available until October 1, 1999.

SEC. 306. HARDROCK LOCATION AND MAINTENANCE FEES.

Title X of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 (Public Law 103-66) is amended as follows:

(1) Section 10101(a) (30 U.S.C. 28f(a)) is amended by striking the first sentence and inserting ''The holder of each unpatented mining claim, mill or tunnel site, located pursuant to the mining laws of the United States, whether located before or after October 1, 1998, shall pay to the Secretary of the Interior, on or before September 1 of each year, for year 1999 and subsequent years, a claim maintenance fee of $116 per claim or site.''.

(2) Section 10102 (30 U.S.C. 28g) is amended by striking ''and before September 30, 1998,'' and striking ''$25.00'' and inserting ''$28''.

(3) Section 10105 (30 U.S.C. 28j) is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end:

''(d) AVAILABILITY OF FEES.—Fees collected under sections 10101 and 10102 (30 U.S.C. 28f and 28g) shall be available without further appropriation for Mining Law Administration program operations in the year following their collection.''.

SEC. 307. IMPOSITION AND USE OF DEPARTMENT OF LABOR EMPLOYER FILING FEES UNDER THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT.

Section 286 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1356) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(s) DEPARTMENT OF LABOR FEES FOR EMPLOYER-RELATED FILINGS.—

''(1) Beginning in fiscal year 2000, the Secretary of Labor shall impose a fee on each person filing with the Secretary an application for a labor certification, an employer attestation, or any similar petition or application, in order to meet a requirement or condition of a program under this title or title I relating to the provision to an alien of an immigrant, or nonimmigrant, employment-based status. The fee with respect a filing under a program shall be in an amount prescribed by the Secretary based on the costs of carrying out the Secretary's duties (including enforcement-related functions) with respect to the program.

''(2) Fees collected under this subsection shall be deposited as an offsetting collection in a fund established for this purpose in the Treasury of the United States.

''(3) No amount shall be collected or obligated for any fiscal year under this subsection, except to the extent provided in appropriations Acts.

''(4) The fees in the fund collected with respect to a program shall remain available until expended to the Secretary, to the extent and in such amounts as may be provided in appropriations Acts, to cover the costs described in paragraph (1) with respect to the program, in addition to any other funds that are available to the Secretary to cover such costs.''.

SEC. 308. COAST GUARD NAVIGATION ASSISTANCE FEES.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND COLLECTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For fiscal year 1999 and each fiscal year thereafter, the Secretary of Transportation shall establish, assess, and collect under section 9701 of title 31, United States Code, fees for the provision of navigation assistance services.

(2) FEE SCHEDULE.—The Secretary shall implement fees under this section by establishment of a schedule for such fees. The Secretary shall publish an interim final rule containing an initial fee schedule not later than 150 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) CREDITING OF FEES.—Fees collected under this section shall be credited as offsetting collections of the Department of Transportation.

(c) AVAILABILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Of amounts of offsetting collections credited for fees under this section—

(A) not to exceed $35,000,000 shall be available to the Secretary of Transportation for fiscal year 1999 for expenses of providing services for which the fees are collected; and

(B) amounts in excess of $35,000,000 shall be available to the Secretary of Transportation for fiscal years after fiscal year 1999 for expenses of providing those services.

(2) AVAILABLE UNTIL EXPENDED.—Amounts available under this section shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 309. SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD.

Section 721 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) USER FEES.—

''(1) SCHEDULE OF FEES.—The Board shall prescribe by regulation a schedule of user fees for carriers subject to the jurisdiction of the Board. The fees—

''(A) shall cover the costs incurred by the Board in carrying out its functions; and

''(B) shall be assessed on each carrier in reasonable relationship to the relative benefits received by the carriers from the functions of the Board.

''(2) COLLECTION OF FEES.—The Board shall prescribe procedures for the collection of fees under this subsection. The Board may use the services of a department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government or of a State or local authority to collect the fees, and may reimburse the department, agency, or instrumentality a reasonable amount for its services.

''(3) USE OF FEES.—Fees collected under this subsection may be used, to the extent provided in advance in appropriation Acts, by the Board for the expenses of carrying out its functions. Any amounts collected in a fiscal year in excess of the amount required for carrying out the functions of the Board for that fiscal year may be retained for use by the Board in a subsequent fiscal year.''.

SEC. 310. WETLANDS PERMIT FEES.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND COLLECTION.—The Secretary of the Army shall establish and collect fees, from applicants for commercial permits under section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, for evaluation of applications for such permits, the preparation of environmental impact statements under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 in connection with the issuance of such permits, and the delineation of wetlands for major developments affecting wetlands.

(b) ARMY CIVIL WORKS REGULATORY PROGRAM.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a special account to be known as the ''Army Civil Works Regulatory Program Account'' into which fees collected by the Secretary under subsection (a) shall be deposited.

(2) USE OF FEES.—Amounts deposited into the Program Account shall be available to the Secretary, as provided in appropriation acts, to apply toward the costs incurred by the Department of the Army in administering laws pertaining to the regulation of navigable waters of the United States, including wetlands. Such amounts shall be in addition to appropriations otherwise available to the Secretary for administering such laws.

SEC. 311. RADIOLOGICAL PREPAREDNESS FEES.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF RADIOLOGICAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS FUND.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a radiological emergency preparedness fund which shall be available under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and Executive Order No. 12657 for offsite radiological emergency planning, preparedness, and response.

(b) FEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For fiscal year 1999 and each fiscal year thereafter, the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall establish (by regulation), assess, and collect fees under this subsection from persons subject to the radiological emergency preparedness regulations issued by the Director.

(2) AGGREGATE AMOUNT.—The aggregate amount of fees assessed and collected under this subsection during a fiscal year shall not be less than the amounts anticipated by the Director to be necessary to carry out the radiological emergency preparedness program of the Federal Emergency Management Agency for such fiscal year.

(3) PROCEDURES.—The methodology for assessment and collection of fees under this subsection shall be fair and equitable. Such fees shall reflect the costs of providing services, including administrative costs of collecting fees.

(4) DEPOSIT.—Fees collected under this subsection shall be deposited in the radiological emergency preparedness fund established under subsection (a) as offsetting collections. An amount equal to the amount of fees so deposited shall become available for authorized purposes on October 1 of the fiscal year in which the fees are collected and shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 312. AVIATION ACCIDENT INVESTIGATION FEE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND COLLECTION.—For fiscal year 1999 and each fiscal year thereafter the Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board shall establish, assess, and collect under section 9701 of title 31, United States Code, fees from air carriers to partially cover the costs of aviation accident investigations. Such fees shall be established by publication of an initial proposed fee schedule as an interim final rule in the Federal Register not later than 150 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—The maximum amount of fees collected under this section shall not exceed $6,000,000 in any fiscal year.

(c) USE OF FEES.—Fees collected under this subsection shall be credited as offsetting collections to an account established in the Treasury of the United States for such purpose and shall be available until expended for necessary expenses for the National Transportation Safety Board in conducting aviation accident investigations, including the hiring of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft and services authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate as authorized by law under sections 5901 and 5902 of such title.

SEC. 313. MONETARY ASSESSMENT ON CLAIMANT REPRESENTATIVES UTILIZING THE SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION'S FEE APPROVAL AND DIRECT PAYMENT PROCESSES.

(a) REPRESENTATIVES OF TITLE II CLAIMANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 206 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 406) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d)(1) In any case in which a fee (exceeding zero) of a person who renders services for compensation in connection with a claim for entitlement to benefits under this title is—

''(A) fixed by the Commissioner pursuant to the last sentence of subsection (a)(1),

''(B) approved by the Commissioner pursuant to subsection (a)(2)(A), or

''(C) determined and allowed by a court pursuant to subsection (b)(1)(A),

the Commissioner shall assess such person an amount determined in accordance with paragraph (2).

''(2) The amount of the assessment under paragraph (1) shall be—

''(A) $165 (or such different amount as the Commissioner may prescribe by regulation), if the Commissioner certifies payment of a fee to a person described in paragraph (1) out of past-due benefits payable under this title pursuant to subsection (a)(4)(A) or (b)(1)(A) (or would so certify such payment but for a reduction to zero authorized by paragraph (3)(A)), or

''(B) $40 (or such different amount as the Commissioner may prescribe by regulation) in any other case.

''(3)(A) Notwithstanding section 3716 of title 31, United States Code, and subsections (a)(4) and (b)(1)(A) of this section, the Commissioner may reduce (to not below zero) the amount otherwise subject to certification for payment as a fee to an attorney from past-due benefits in order to recover any assessment or assessments under this subsection owing by such attorney (without regard to whether such assessments derive from the claim giving rise to the past-due benefits in connection with which the fee payment is subject to certification).

''(B) The Commissioner shall establish by regulation procedures for the collection of assessments under this subsection not recoverable as provided in subparagraph (A).

''(4) Assessments collected under this subsection shall be credited to a special trust fund receipt account established in the Treasury of the United States for assessments on representatives under this subsection. The amounts so credited, to the extent and in the amounts provided in advance in appropriations Acts, shall be available to defray expenses incurred in carrying out this title and related laws.

''(5) From amounts credited under paragraph (4) to the special account established in the Treasury of the United States for assessments on representatives under this subsection, there is authorized to be appropriated an amount not to exceed $19,000,000 for fiscal year 1999, $26,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, and such sums as may be necessary for each fiscal year thereafter, for administrative expenses in carrying out this title and related laws.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 206(a)(4)(A) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 406(a)(4)(A)) is amended by striking the period and inserting '', except that the amount otherwise subject to certification may be reduced (to not less than zero) pursuant to subsection (d)(3)(A).''.

(B) Section 206(b)(1)(A) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 406(b)(1)(A)) is amended by striking the period at the end of the first sentence and inserting '', except that the amount otherwise subject to certification may be reduced (to not less than zero) pursuant to subsection (d)(3)(A).''.

(b) REPRESENTATIVES OF TITLE XVI CLAIMANTS.—Section 1631(d)(2) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1383(d)(2)) is amended by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C) and by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraph:

''(B) The provisions of section 206(d) shall apply to this part to the same extent as they apply in the case of title II, except that—

''(i) references therein to title II shall be deemed to be references to title XVI;

''(ii) references to entitlement to benefits under title II shall be deemed to be references to eligibility for benefits under this title;

''(iii) such provisions shall apply only with respect to assessments applicable to cases other than cases involving certification of payment of a fee to a representative out of past-due benefits; and

''(iv) the total amount of the appropriations authorized in paragraph (5) thereof for carrying out this title and title II may not exceed $19,000,000 for fiscal year 1999 and $26,000,000 for fiscal year 2000.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to any person who, for a fee, represents or otherwise assists a claimant with a claim arising under title II or title XVI of the Social Security Act, and whose representation of such claimant in connection with such claim commences on or after the 60th day following the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 314. RAILROAD SAFETY.

Section 20115(e) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''1995'' and inserting ''2003''.

SEC. 315. INCREASE IN CUSTOMS MERCHANDISE PROCESSING FEE.

Section 13031 of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a)(9)(B)(i) is amended by striking ''0.21 percent nor less than 0.15 percent'' and inserting ''0.25 nor less than 0.15 percent''.

(2) Subsection (f) is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (5) and (6), respectively;

(B) in paragraph (5), as so redesignated, by striking ''paragraph (5)'' and inserting ''paragraph (6)'';

(C) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

''(4) Fees collected under subsection (a)(9) in excess of .21 percent ad valorem shall be available until expended for necessary expenses incurred by the Secretary of the Treasury for the National Customs Automation Program established under section 411 of the Tariff Act of 1930, in addition to amounts otherwise available for such purpose.''; and

(D) in paragraph (1)(B) by striking ''paragraph (5)'' and inserting ''paragraph (6)''.

SEC. 316. PESTICIDE REGISTRATION FEES.

Section 4(i) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a–1(i)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6), by striking ''(5)'' and inserting ''(6)'';

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (6) and (7) as paragraphs (7) and (8), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (5) the following:

''(6) REGISTRATION FEES.—

''(A) AUTHORITY TO LEVY FEE.—The Administrator may levy fees upon applicants for registration and amendments to registration under section 3 of this Act and applicants for experimental use permits under section 5 of this Act, pursuant to regulations similar to sections 152.410(b), 152.412, and 152.414 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect as of July 1, 1997), in amounts sufficient to cover costs associated with the review of such applications.

''(B) TIME OF PAYMENT.—An applicant upon whom a fee is levied under this paragraph shall pay the fee at the time of application, unless otherwise specified by the Administrator.

''(C) EFFECT OF FAILURE TO PAY BY TIME PRESCRIBED.—The Administrator may, by order and without a hearing, deny the application of any applicant who fails to pay, within such time as the Administrator has prescribed, any fee levied on the applicant under this paragraph.

''(D) AUTHORITY TO REDUCE OR WAIVE FEE.—The Administrator may reduce or waive any fee that would otherwise be assessed under this paragraph—

''(i) in connection with an application for an active ingredient that is contained only in pesticides for which registration is sought solely for agricultural or nonagricultural minor use; and

''(ii) in such other circumstances as the Administrator determines to be in the public interest.

''(E) USE OF FEES.—The Administrator shall deposit in a special fund in the Treasury of the United States all fees collected under this paragraph, and the amount of such fees shall be available, subject to appropriation, to carry out the activities of the Environmental Protection Agency in the issuance of the registrations under sections 3 and 5 in respect of which the fees were paid.''.

SEC. 317. CHEMICAL PRE–MANUFACTURING NOTIFICATION FEES.

Notwithstanding section 26(b)(1) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2625(b)(1)), the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency is authorized to assess, in fiscal year 1999 and thereafter, fees from any person required to submit data under section 4 or 5 of such Act (15 U.S.C. 2603, 2604) without regard to the dollar limitations established in section 26(b)(1) of such Act. Such fees shall be calculated to cover costs associated with administering those sections of such Act, and shall be paid at the time of data submission, unless otherwise specified by the Administrator. The Administrator may take into account the ability to pay of the person required to submit the data and the cost to the Administrator of reviewing such data. The Administrator shall promulgate rules to implement this section. Such rules may provide for allocating the fee in any case in which the expenses of data submission under section 4 or 5 of such Act are shared. Increased fees collected under this section shall be deposited in a special fund in the United States Treasury, which thereafter will be available, subject to appropriation, to carry out the Administration's activities for which such fees are collected.

SEC. 318. NRC USER FEES AND ANNUAL CHARGES.

Section 6101(a)(3) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 2214(a)(3)) is amended by striking ''September 30, 1998'' and inserting ''September 30, 2003''.

SEC. 318. BANK EXAMINATION FEES.

(a) FDIC EXAMINATION FEES.—Section 10(e)(1) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1820(e)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

''(A) REGULATORY EXAMINATIONS.—Subject to paragraph (6), the cost of conducting any examination under subsection (b)(2) of an insured depository institution described in subparagraph (A) of such subsection shall be assessed by the Corporation against the institution in an amount sufficient to meet the Corporation's expenses in carrying out the examination.

''(B) INSURANCE EXAMINATIONS.—The cost of conducting any examination of a depository institution under subsection (b)(2) or (b)(3), other than an examination to which subparagraph (A) applies, may be assessed by the Corporation against the institution to meet the Corporation's expenses in carrying out the examination.''.

(b) FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD EXAMINATION FEES.—The 2d sentence of the 8th undesignated paragraph of section 9 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 326) is amended—

(1) by striking ''may, in the discretion of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, be assessed'' and inserting ''shall be assessed, subject to section 10(e)(6) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act,''; and

(2) by striking ''and, when so assessed, shall be paid'' and inserting ''and shall be paid''.

(c) REASONABLE REDUCTION IN EXAMINATION FEES FOR STATE BANKS AND SAVINGS ASSOCIATIONS.—Section 10(e) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1820(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6) REDUCTIONS AND EXEMPTIONS.—

''(A) REDUCTION FOR DEPOSITORY INSTITUTIONS SUBJECT TO DUAL SUPERVISION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The amount of any assessment or other fee imposed on any State depository institution for an annual regular examination—

''(I) by the Corporation under paragraph (1)(A);

''(II) by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System under the 8th undesignated paragraph of section 9 of the Federal Reserve Act; or

''(III) by the Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision under section 9(a) of the Home Owners' Loan Act,

during any 12-month period may be reduced to the extent the agency determines to be appropriate to reflect the fact that the supervision of such State depository institution by an appropriate State bank supervisor has reduced the need for Federal supervision.

''(ii) LIMIT ON AMOUNT OF REDUCTION.—The amount of any reduction under clause (i) with respect to any State depository institution shall not exceed the amount of an assessment or fee imposed on such institution by the State bank supervisor for the most recent examination of the institution by the supervisor before January 1, 1998 (or, in the case of an institution which was not subject to an examination by the State bank supervisor before such date, the amount which the appropriate Federal banking agency reasonably determines would have been imposed by such supervisor for an examination of the institution as of such date).

''(iii) ADJUSTMENT FOR INFLATION.—For purposes of clause (ii), the amount described in such clause shall be adjusted annually after December 31, 1998, by the annual percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index for Urban Wage Earners and Clerical Workers published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

''(B) EXEMPTION FOR STATE DEPOSITORY INSTITUTIONS WITH ASSETS OF LESS THAN $100,000,000.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no assessment or other fee for an annual regular examination may be imposed on any State depository institution which has total assets of less than $100,000,000—

''(i) by the Corporation under paragraph (1)(A);

''(ii) by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System under the 8th undesignated paragraph of section 9 of the Federal Reserve Act; or

''(iii) by the Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision under section 9(a) of the Home Owners' Loan Act.''.

(d) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 10(b)(2) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1820(b)(2) is amended by inserting ''an examination is required under subsection (d)(1) or'' after ''whenever''.

(2) Section 10(d)(4) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1820(d)(4)) is amended by inserting ''and subsection (e)(6)'' after ''(1), (2), and (3)''.

(e) REPORT ON FEES REQUIRED TO BE IMPOSED ON BANK HOLDING COMPANIES.—Before January 31 of each calendar year which begins after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall submit a report to the Congress containing—

(1) the total costs incurred by the Board during the year preceding the year of such report which are attributable to each examination of a bank holding company conducted during such year pursuant to section 5(c) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956; and

(2) the total amount assessed against, and paid by, each bank holding company under such section for the examination.

SEC. 319. EXTENSION OF THE RECREATIONAL FEE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.

(a) AUTHORITY.—The authority provided to the National Park Service under the recreational fee demonstration program authorized by section 315 of Public Law 104–134 (16 U.S.C. 460l–6a note)—

(1) is extended through September 30, 2005; and

(2) shall be available for all units of the National Park System, except that no recreational admission fee may be charged at Great Smoky Mountains National Park and Lincoln Home National Historic Site.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than September 30, 2000, the Secretary of the Interior shall submit to the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report detailing the status of the recreational fee demonstration program conducted in national parks under section 315 of Public Law 104–134 (16 U.S.C. 460l–6a note).

(2) CONTENTS.—The report under paragraph (1) shall contain—

(A) an evaluation of the fee demonstration program conducted at each national park;

(B) with respect to each national park, a description of the criteria that were used to determine whether a recreational fee should or should not be charged at the national park; and

(C) a description of the manner in which the amount of the fee at each national park was established.

SEC. 320. CONCESSIONS REFORM.

(a) FINDINGS.—In furtherance of the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended (16 U.S.C. 1, 2–4), which directs the Secretary of the Interior to administer areas of the National Park System in accordance with the fundamental purpose of preserving their scenery, wildlife, natural and historic objects, and providing for their enjoyment in a manner that will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations, the Congress finds that the preservation and conservation of park resources and values requires that such public accommodations, facilities, and services as the Secretary determines are necessary and appropriate in accordance with this Act—

(1) should be provided only under carefully controlled safeguards against unregulated and indiscriminate use so that visitation will not unduly impair these values; and

(2) should be limited to locations and designs consistent to the highest practicable degree with the preservation and conservation of park resources and values.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the Congress that—

(1) development on Federal lands within a park shall be limited to those facilities and services that the Secretary determines are necessary and appropriate for public use and enjoyment of the park in which such facilities and services are located;

(2) development of such facilities and services within a park should be consistent to the highest practicable degree with the preservation and conservation of the park's resources and values;

(3) such facilities and services should be provided by private persons, corporations, or other entities, except when no qualified private interest is willing to provide such facilities and services;

(4) if the Secretary determines that development should be provided within a park, such development shall be designed, located, and operated in a manner that is consistent with the purposes for which such park was established;

(5) the right to provide such services and to develop or utilize such facilities should be awarded to the person, corporation, or entity submitting the best proposal through a competitive selection process; and

(6) such facilities or services should be provided to the public at reasonable rates.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section:

(1) The term ''concessioner'' means a person, corporation, or other entity to whom a concession contract has been awarded.

(2) The term ''concession contract'' means a contract or permit (but not a commercial use authorization issued pursuant to section 6) to provide facilities or services, or both, at a park.

(3) The term ''facilities'' means improvements to real property within parks used to provide accommodations, facilities, or services to park visitors.

(4) The term ''park'' means a unit of the National Park System.

(5) The term ''proposal'' means the complete proposal for a concession contract offered by a potential or existing concessioner in response to the minimum requirements for the contract established by the Secretary.

(6) The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(d) REPEAL OF CONCESSION POLICY ACT OF 1965.—

(1) REPEAL.—The Act of October 9, 1965, Public Law 89–249 (79 Stat. 969, 16 U.S.C. 20–20g), entitled ''An Act relating to the establishment of concession policies administered in the areas administered by the National Park Service and for other purposes'', is hereby repealed. The repeal of such section shall not affect the validity of any contract entered into under such Act, but the provisions of this Act shall apply to any such contract except to the extent such provisions are inconsistent with the express terms and conditions of the contract.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The fourth sentence of section 3 of the Act of August 25, 1916 (16 U.S.C. 3; 39 Stat. 535) is amended by striking all through ''no natural'' and inserting in lieu thereof, ''No natural''.

(e) CONCESSION POLICY.—Subject to the findings and policy stated in subsections (a) and (b), and upon a determination by the Secretary that facilities or services are necessary and appropriate for the accommodation of visitors at a park, the Secretary shall, consistent with the provisions of this section, laws relating generally to the administration and management of units of the National Park System, and the park's general management plan, concession plan, and other applicable plans, authorize private persons, corporations, or other entities to provide and operate such facilities or services as the Secretary deems necessary and appropriate.

(f) COMMERCIAL USE AUTHORIZATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—To the extent specified in this section, the Secretary, upon request, may authorize a private person, corporation,

or other entity to provide services to park visitors through a commercial use authorization.

(2) CRITERIA FOR ISSUANCE OF AUTHORIZATION.—(A) The authority of this subsection may be used only to authorize provision of services that the Secretary determines will have minimal impact on park resources and values and which are consistent with the purposes for which the park was established and with all applicable management plans for such park.

(B) The Secretary—

(i) shall require payment of a reasonable fee for issuance for an authorization under this subsection, such fees to remain available without further appropriation to be used, at a minimum, to recover associated management and administration costs;

(ii) shall require that the provision of services under such an authorization be accomplished in a manner consistent to the highest practicable degree with the preservation and conservation of park resources and values;

(iii) shall take appropriate steps to limit the liability of the United States arising from the provision of services under such an authorization; and

(iv) shall have no authority under this subsection to issue more authorizations than are consistent with the preservation and proper management of park resources and values, and shall establish such other conditions for issuance of such an authorization as the Secretary determines appropriate for the protection of visitors, provision of adequate and appropriate visitor services, and protection and proper management of the resources and values of the park.

(3) LIMITATIONS.—Any authorization issued under this subsection shall be limited to—

(A) commercial operations with annual gross revenues of not more than $25,000 resulting from services originating and provided solely within a park pursuant to such authorization; or

(B) the incidental use of park resources by commercial operations which provide services originating outside of the park's boundaries: *Provided,* That such authorization shall not provide for the construction of any structure, fixture, or improvement on Federal lands within the park.

(4) DURATION.—The term of any authorization issued under this subsection shall not exceed 2 years.

(5) OTHER CONTRACTS.—A person, corporation, or other entity seeking or obtaining an authorization pursuant to this subsection shall not be precluded from also submitting proposals for concession contracts.

(g) COMPETITIVE SELECTION PROCESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—(A) Except as provided in paragraph (2), and consistent with the provisions of paragraph (7), any concession contract entered into pursuant to this section shall be awarded to the person, corporation, or other entity submitting the best proposal as determined by the Secretary, through a competitive selection process, as provided in this section.

(B)(i) As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall promulgate appropriate regulations establishing the competitive selection process.

(ii) The regulations shall include provisions for establishing a procedure for the resolution of disputes between the Secretary and a concessioner in those instances where the Secretary has been unable to meet conditions or requirements or provide such services, if any, as set forth in a prospectus pursuant to paragraph (3).

(2) TEMPORARY CONTRACT.—Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1), the Secretary may award a temporary concession contract in order to avoid interruption of services to the public at a park, except that prior to making such a determination, the Secretary shall take all reasonable and appropriate steps to consider alternatives to avoid such an interruption.

(3) PROSPECTUS.—(A)(i) Prior to soliciting proposals for a concession contract at a park, the Secretary shall prepare a prospectus soliciting proposals, and shall publish a notice of its availability at least once in local or national newspapers or trade publications, as appropriate, and shall make such prospectus available upon request to all interested parties.

(ii) A prospectus shall assign a weight to each factor identified therein related to the importance of such factor in the selection process. Points shall be awarded for each such factor, based on the relative strength of the proposal concerning that factor.

(B) The prospectus shall include, but need not be limited to, the following information—

(i) the minimum requirements for such contract, as set forth in subsection (d);

(ii) the terms and conditions of the existing concession contract awarded for such park, if any, including all fees and other forms of compensation provided to the United States by the concessioner;

(iii) other authorized facilities or services which may be provided in a proposal;

(iv) facilities and services to be provided by the Secretary to the concessioner, if any, including but not limited to, public access, utilities, and buildings;

(v) minimum public services to be offered within a park by the Secretary, including but not limited to, interpretive programs, campsites, and visitor centers; and

(vi) such other information related to the proposed concession operation as is provided to the Secretary pursuant to a concession contract or is otherwise available to the Secretary, as the Secretary determines is necessary to allow for the submission of competitive proposals.

(4) MINIMUM PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS.—(A) No proposal shall be considered which fails to meet the minimum requirements as determined by the Secretary. Such minimum requirements shall include, but need not be limited to—

(i) the minimum acceptable franchise fee;

(ii) any facilities, services, or capital investment required to be provided by the concessioner; and

(iii) measures necessary to ensure the protection and preservation of park resources.

(B) The Secretary shall reject any proposal, notwithstanding the franchise fee offered, if the Secretary determines that the person, corporation, or entity is not qualified, is likely to provide unsatisfactory service, or that the proposal is not responsive to the objectives of protecting and preserving park resources and of providing necessary and appropriate facilities or services to the public at reasonable rates.

(C) If all proposals submitted to the Secretary either fail to meet the minimum requirements or are rejected by the Secretary, the Secretary shall establish new minimum contract requirements and re-initiate the competitive selection process pursuant to this section.

(5) SELECTION OF BEST PROPOSAL.—(A) In selecting the best proposal, the Secretary shall consider the following principal factors:

(i) the responsiveness of the proposal to the objectives of protecting and preserving park resources and of providing necessary and appropriate facilities and services to the public at reasonable rates;

(ii) the experience and related background of the person, corporation, or entity submitting the proposal, including but not limited to, the past performance and expertise of such person, corporation, or entity in providing the same or similar facilities or services;

(iii) the financial capability of the person, corporation, or entity submitting the proposal; and

(iv) the proposed franchise fee: *Provided,* That consideration of revenue to the United States shall be subordinate to the objectives of protecting and preserving park resources and of providing necessary and appropriate facilities or services to the public at reasonable rates.

(B) The Secretary may also consider such secondary factors as the Secretary deems appropriate.

(C) In developing regulations to implement this Act, the Secretary shall consider the extent to which plans for employment of Indians (including Native Alaskans) and involvement of businesses owned by Indians, Indian tribes, or Native Alaskans in the operation of concession contracts should be identified as a factor in the selection of a best proposal under this section.

(6) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—(A) The Secretary shall submit any proposed concession contract with anticipated annual gross receipts in excess of $5,000,000 or a duration of 10 or more years to the Committee on Resources of the United States House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the United States Senate.

(B) The Secretary shall not award any such proposed contract until at least 60 days subsequent to the notification of both Committees.

(7) NO PREFERENTIAL RIGHT OF RENEWAL.—(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall not grant a preferential right to a concessioner to renew a concession contract entered into pursuant to this section.

(B)(i) The Secretary shall grant a preferential right of renewal with respect to a concession contract covered by paragraphs (8) and (9), subject to the requirements of the appropriate subsection.

(ii) As used in this paragraph, and paragraphs (8) and (9), the term ''preferential right of renewal'' means that the Secretary shall allow a concessioner satisfying the requirements of this paragraph (and paragraphs (8) or (9), as appropriate) the opportunity to match the terms and conditions of any competing proposal which the Secretary determines to be the best proposal.

(iii) A concessioner who exercises a preferential right of renewal in accordance with the requirements of this subparagraph shall be entitled to award of the new concession contract with respect to which such right is exercised.

(8) OUTFITTING AND GUIDE CONTRACTS.—(A) The provisions of paragraph (g)(2) shall apply only—

(i) to a concession contract—

(I) which solely authorizes a concessioner to provide outfitting, guide, river running, or other substantially similar services within a park; and

(II) which does not grant such concessioner any interest in any structure, fixture, or improvement pursuant to subsection (l); and

(ii) where the Secretary determines that the concessioner has operated satisfactorily during the term of the contract (including any extensions thereof); and

(iii) where the Secretary determines that the concessioner has submitted a responsive proposal for a new contract which satisfies the minimum requirements established by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (4).

(B) With respect to a concession contract (or extension thereof) covered by this subsection which is in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, the provisions of this paragraph shall apply if the holder of such contact, under the laws and policies in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, would have been entitled to a preferential right to renew such contract upon its expiration.

(9) CONTRACTS WITH ANNUAL GROSS RECEIPTS UNDER $500,000.—(A) The provisions of paragraph (7)(B) shall also apply to a concession contract—

(i) which the Secretary estimates will result in annual gross receipts of less than $500,000;

(ii) where the Secretary has determined that the concessioner has operated satisfactorily during the term of the contract (including any extensions thereof); and

(iii) that the concessioner has submitted a responsive proposal for a new concession contract which satisfies the minimum requirements established by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (4).

(B) The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply to a concession contract which solely authorizes a concessioner to provide outfitting, guide, river running, or other substantially similar services within a park pursuant to paragraph (8).

(10) NO PREFERENTIAL RIGHT TO ADDITIONAL SERVICES.—The Secretary shall not grant a preferential right to a concessioner to provide new or additional services at a park.

(h) FRANCHISE FEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Franchise fees shall not be less than the minimum fee established by the Secretary for each contract. The minimum fee shall be determined in a manner that will provide the concessioner with a reasonable opportunity to realize a profit on the operation as a whole, commensurate with the capital invested and the obligations assumed under the contract.

(2) MULTIPLE CONTRACTS WITHIN A PARK.—If multiple concession contracts are awarded to authorize concessioners to provide the same or similar outfitting, guide, river running, or other similar services at the same approximate location or resource within a specific park, the Secretary shall establish an identical franchise fee for all such contracts, subject to periodic review and revision by the Secretary. Such fee shall reflect fair market value.

(e) ADJUSTMENT OF FRANCHISE FEES.—The amount of any franchise fee for the term of the concession contract shall be specified in the concession contract and may only be modified to reflect substantial changes from the conditions specified or anticipated in the contract.

(i) USE OF FRANCHISE FEES.—

(1) DEPOSITS TO TREASURY.—All receipts collected pursuant to this section shall be covered into a special account established in the Treasury of the United States. Except as provided in paragraph (2), amounts covered into such account in a fiscal year shall be available for expenditure, subject to appropriation, solely as follows:

(A) 50 percent shall be allocated among the units of the National Park System in the same proportion as franchise fees collected from a specific unit bears to the total amount covered into the account for each fiscal year, to be used for resource management and protection, maintenance activities, interpretation, and research.

(B) 50 percent shall be allocated among the units of the National Park System on the basis of need, in a manner to be determined by the Secretary, to be used for resource management and protection, maintenance activities, interpretation, and research.

(2) SPECIAL ACCOUNT.—Beginning in fiscal year 1998, all receipts collected in the previous year in excess of the following amounts shall be made available from the special account to the Secretary without further appropriation, to be allocated among the units of the National Park System on the basis of need, in a manner to be determined by the Secretary, to be used for resource management and protection, maintenance activities, interpretation, and research:

(A) $17,000,000 for fiscal year 1998.

(B) $18,000,000 for fiscal year 1999.

(C) $18,000,000 for fiscal year 2000.

(D) $18,000,000 for fiscal year 2001.

(E) $18,000,000 for fiscal year 2002.

(3) EXISTING CONCESSIONER IMPROVEMENT FUNDS.—Nothing in this section shall affect or restrict the use of funds maintained by a concessioner in an existing concessioner improvement account pursuant to a concession contract in effect as of the date of enactment of this Act. No new, renewed, or extended contracts entered into after the date of enactment of this Act shall provide for or authorize the use of such concessioner improvement accounts.

(4) INSPECTOR GENERAL AUDITS.—Beginning in fiscal year 1998, the Inspector General of the Department of the Interior shall conduct a biennial audit of the concession fees generated pursuant to this section. The Inspector General shall make a determination as to whether concession fees are being collected and expended in accordance with this Act and shall submit copies of each audit to the Committee on Resources of the United States House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the United States Senate.

(j) DURATION OF CONTRACT.—

(1) MAXIMUM TERM.—A concession contract entered into pursuant to this section shall be awarded for a term not to exceed 10 years: *Provided, however,* That the Secretary may award a contract for a term of up to 20 years if the Secretary determines that the contract terms and conditions necessitate a longer term.

(2) TEMPORARY CONTRACT.—A temporary concession contract awarded on a non-competitive basis pursuant to subsection (f)(2) shall be for a term not to exceed 2 years.

(k) TRANSFER OF CONTRACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—No concession contract may be transferred, assigned, sold, or otherwise conveyed by a concessioner without prior written notification to, and approval of the Secretary.

(2) APPROVAL OF TRANSFER.—The Secretary shall not unreasonably withhold approval of a transfer, assignment, sale, or conveyance of a concession contract, but shall not approve the transfer, assignment, sale, or conveyance of a concession contract to any individual, corporation or other entity if the Secretary determines that—

(A) such individual, corporation or entity is, or is likely to be, unable to completely satisfy all of the requirements, terms, and conditions of the contract;

(B) such transfer, assignment, sale or conveyance is not consistent with the objectives of protecting and preserving park resources, and of providing necessary and appropriate facilities or services to the public at reasonable rates;

(C) such transfer, assignment, sale, or conveyance relates to a concession contract which does not provide to the United States consideration commensurate with the probable value of the privileges granted by the contract; or

(D) the terms of such transfer, assignment, sale, or conveyance directly or indirectly attribute a significant value to intangible assets or otherwise may so reduce the opportunity for a reasonable profit over the remaining term of the contract that the United States may be required to make substantial additional expenditures in order to avoid interruption of services to park visitors.

(l) PROTECTION OF CONCESSIONER INVESTMENT.—

(1) CURRENT CONTRACT.—(A) A concessioner who before the date of the enactment of this Act has acquired or constructed, or is required under an existing concession contract to commence acquisition or construction of any structure, fixture, or improvement upon land owned by the United States within a park, pursuant to such contract, shall have a possessory interest therein, to the extent provided by such contract.

(B) Unless otherwise provided in such contract, said possessory interest shall not be extinguished by the expiration or termination of the contract and may not be taken for public use without just compensation. Such possessory interest may be assigned, transferred, encumbered, or relinquished.

(C) Upon the termination of a concession contract in effect before the date of enactment of this title, the Secretary shall determine the value of any outstanding possesory interest applicable to the contract, such value to be determined for all purposes on the basis of applicable laws and contracts in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act.

(D) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to grant a possessory interest to a concessioner whose contract in effect on the date of enactment of this Act does not include recognition of a possessory interest.

(2) NEW CONTRACTS.—(A)(i) With respect to a concession contract entered into on or after the date of enactment of this Act, the value of any outstanding possessory interest associated with such contract shall be set at the value determined by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (1)(C).

(ii) As a condition of entering into a concession contract, the value of any outstanding possessory interest shall be reduced on an annual basis, in equal portions, over the same number of years as the time period associated with the straight line depreciation of the structure, fixture, or improvement associated with such possessory interest, as provided by applicable Federal income tax laws and regulations in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act.

(iii) In the event that the contract expires or is terminated prior to the elimination of any outstanding possessory interest, the concessioner shall be entitled to receive from the United States or the successor concessioner payment equal to the remaining value of the possessory interest.

(iv) A successor concessioner may not revalue any outstanding possessory interest, nor the period of time over which such interest is reduced.

(v) Title to any structure, fixture, or improvement associated with any outstanding possessory interest shall be vested in the United States.

(B)(i) If the Secretary determines during the competitive selection process that all proposals submitted either fail to meet the minimum requirements or are rejected (as provided in subsection (g)), the Secretary may, solely with respect to any outstanding possessory interest associated with the contract and established pursuant to a concession contract entered into prior to the date of enactment of this Act, suspend the reduction provisions of paragraph (2)(A)(i) for the duration of the contract, and re-initiate the competitive selection process as provided in subsection (g).

(ii) The Secretary may suspend such reduction provisions only if the Secretary determines that the establishment of other new minimum contract requirements is not likely to result in the submission of satisfactory proposals, and that the suspension of the reduction provisions is likely to result in the submission of satisfactory proposals: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to require the Secretary to establish a minimum franchise fee at a level below the franchise fee in effect for such contract on the day before the expiration date of the previous contract.

(3) NEW STRUCTURES.—(A) On or after the date of enactment of this Act, a concessioner who constructs or acquires a new, additional, or replacement structure, fixture, or improvement upon land owned by the United States within a park, pursuant to a concession contract, shall have an interest in such structure, fixture, or improvement equivalent to the actual original cost of acquiring or constructing such structure, fixture, or improvement, less straight line depreciation over the estimated useful life of the asset according to Generally Accepted Accounting Principles: *Provided,* That in no event shall the estimated useful life of such asset exceed the depreciation period used for such asset for Federal income tax purposes.

(B) In the event that the contract expires or is terminated prior to the recovery of such costs, the concessioner shall be entitled to receive from the United States or the successor concessioner payment equal to the value of the concessioner's interest in such structure, fixture, or improvement. A successor concessioner may not revalue the interest in such structure, fixture, or improvement, the method of depreciation, or the estimated useful life of the asset.

(C) Title to any such structure, fixture, or improvement shall be vested in the United States.

(4) INSURANCE, MAINTENANCE, AND REPAIR.—Nothing in this subsection shall affect the obligation of a concessioner to insure, maintain, and repair any structure, fixture, or improvement assigned to such concessioner and to insure that such structure, fixture, or improvement fully complies with applicable safety and health laws and regulations.

(m) RATES AND CHARGES TO PUBLIC.—The reasonableness of a concessioner's rates and charges to the public shall, unless otherwise provided in the bid specifications and contract, be judged primarily by comparison with those rates and charges for facilities and services of comparable character under similar conditions, with due consideration for length of season, seasonal variance, average percentage of occupancy, accessibility, availability and costs of labor and materials, type of patronage, and other factors deemed significant by the Secretary.

(n) CONCESSIONER PERFORMANCE EVALUATION.—

(1) REGULATIONS.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall publish, after an appropriate period for public comment, regulations establishing standards and criteria for evaluating the performance of concessions operating within parks.

(2) PERIODIC EVALUATION.—(A) The Secretary shall periodically conduct an evaluation of each concessioner operating under a concession contract pursuant to this Act, as appropriate, to determine whether such concessioner has performed satisfactorily. In evaluating a concessioner's performance, the Secretary shall seek and consider applicable reports and comments from appropriate Federal, State, and local regulatory agencies, and shall seek and consider the applicable views of park visitors and concession customers. If the Secretary's performance evaluation results in an unsatisfactory rating of the concessioner's overall operation, the Secretary shall provide the concessioner with a list of the minimum requirements necessary for the operation to be rated satisfactory, and shall so notify the concessioner in writing.

(B) The Secretary may terminate a concession contract if the concessioner fails to meet the minimum operational requirements identified by the Secretary within the time limitations established by the Secretary at the time notice of the unsatisfactory rating is provided to the concessioner.

(C) If the Secretary terminates a concession contract pursuant to this section, the Secretary shall solicit proposals for a new contract consistent with the provisions of this Act.

(o) RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each concessioner shall keep such records as the Secretary may prescribe to enable the Secretary to determine that all terms of the concessioner's contract have been, and are being faithfully performed, and the Secretary or any of the Secretary's duly authorized representatives shall, for the purpose of audit and examination, have access to such records and to other books, documents, and papers of the concessioner pertinent to the contract and all the terms and conditions thereof as the Secretary deems necessary.

(2) GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE REVIEW.—The Comptroller General of the United States or any of his or her duly authorized representatives shall, until the expiration of five calendar years after the close of the business year for each concessioner, have access to and the right to examine any pertinent books, documents, papers, and records of the concessioner related to the contracts or contracts involved.

(p) EXEMPTION FROM CERTAIN LEASE REQUIREMENTS.—The provisions of section 321 of the Act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 412; 40 U.S.C. 303b), relating to the leasing of buildings and properties of the United States, shall not apply to contracts awarded by the Secretary pursuant to this section.

(q) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

SEC. 321. FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION USER FEES.

(a) USER FUNDING OF THE FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION.—Section 48104(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) any cost incurred by the Federal Aviation Administration after September 30, 1999, that is authorized by law.''.

(b) COST RECOVERY FOR FOREIGN AVIATION SERVICES AND CLARIFICATION OF OVERFLIGHT FEE AUTHORITY.—Section 45301 of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2), by inserting ''or to any entity obtaining services outside the United States'' before the period; and

(2) by striking the period after ''rendered'' and inserting '', including both direct and indirect costs, as determined by the Administrator, using generally accepted accounting principles and internationally accepted economic principles.''.

TITLE IV—TAX INCREASES

SEC. 401. TAX INCREASES.

It is the sense of the House of Representatives that the following tax increases proposed by the President should be enacted as soon as possible:

(1) ACCOUNTING PROVISIONS.—

(A) Repeal lower of cost or market inventory accounting method.

(B) Repeal nonaccrual experience method of accounting and make certain trade receivables ineligible for mark-to-market treatment.

(2) FINANCIAL PRODUCTS AND INSTITUTIONS.—

(A) Defer interest deduction on certain convertible debt.

(B) Extend pro rata disallowance of tax-exempt interest expense that applies to banks to all financial intermediaries.

(3) CORPORATE TAX PROVISIONS.—

(A) Eliminate dividends received deduction for certain preferred stock.

(B) Repeal tax-free conversion of large C corporations into S corporations.

(C) Restrict special net operating loss carryback rules for specified liability losses.

(D) Clarify the meaning of ''subject to'' liabilities under section 357(c).

(4) INSURANCE PROVISIONS.—

(A) Increase the proration percentage for property and casualty insurance companies.

(B) Capitalize net premiums for credit life insurance contracts.

(C) Modify corporate-owned life insurance rules.

(D) Modify reserve rules for annuity contracts.

(E) Tax certain exchanges of insurance contracts and reallocations of assets within variable insurance contracts.

(F) Modify computation of ''investment in the contract'' for mortality and expense charges on certain insurance contracts.

(5) ESTATE AND GIFT TAX PROVISIONS.—

(A) Eliminate nonbusiness valuation discounts.

(B) Modify treatment of gifts of ''present interests'' in a trust (repeal ''Crummey'' case rule).

(C) Eliminate gift tax exemption for personal residence trusts.

(D) Include qualified terminable interest property trust assets in surviving spouse's estate.

(6) FOREIGN TAX PROVISIONS.—

(A) Replace sales source rules with activity-based rule.

(B) Modify rules relating to foreign oil and gas extraction income.

(C) Apply ''80/20'' company rules on a group-wide basis.

(D) Prescribe regulations regarding foreign built-in losses.

(E) Prescribe regulations regarding use of hybrids.

(F) Modify foreign office material participation exception applicable to certain inventory sales.

(G) Modify controlled foreign corporation exception from United States tax on transportation income.

(7) ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.—

(A) Increase penalties for failure to file correct information returns.

(B) Modify definition of substantial understatement penalty for large corporations.

(C) Repeal exemption for withholding on gambling.

(D) Modify deposit requirement for FUTA.

(E) Clarify and expand math error procedures.

(8) REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT COMPANY PROVISIONS.—

(A) Freeze grandfathered status of stapled or paired-share REITs.

(B) Restrict impermissible businesses indirectly conducted by REITs.

(C) Modify treatment of closely held REITs.

(9) EARNED INCOME TAX COMPLIANCE PROVISIONS.—

(A) Simplify foster child definition under the earned income credit.

(B) Modify definition of qualifying child for purposes of the earned income credit where more than one taxpayer satisfies the requirements with respect to the same child.

(10) OTHER REVENUE-INCREASE PROVISIONS.—

(A) Repeal percentage depletion for certain nonfuel minerals mined on Federal and formerly Federal lands.

(B) Modify depreciation method for tax-exempt use property.

(C) Impose excise tax on purchase of structured settlements.

(D) Reinstate Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund excise tax and increase Trust Fund ceiling to $5,000,000,000 (through September 30, 2008).

(11) REINSTATE HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE SUPERFUND EXCISE TAX AND ENVIRONMENTAL INCOME TAX.—

(A) Reinstate Superfund corporate environmental income tax.

(B) Reinstate Superfund excise taxes (through September 30, 2008).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), as the designee for the minority leader, each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON).

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing the bill but opposing the bill. Is there a Member here in favor of the bill to claim the time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) the designee of the minority leader?

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the bill. In fact, I cannot find anybody in the Chamber that is in favor of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The answer to the gentleman's inquiry is no, the gentleman need not be in favor of the bill.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, that does not show very much support for the President of the United States wanting to increase taxes and fees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unanimous consent request only requires that the minority leader or his designee control the time. He does not have to be in favor of the bill.

Mr. SOLOMON. So the Member claiming the time does not have to be in favor of the President's tax and fee increases?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I know it is only 9:00 in the morning and unusual for us to start this early. I know that we were here until the wee hours, I know I was, this morning. I just hope Members are listening if they do not have the opportunity to come to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, this is very, very important. In February of this year, President Clinton sent the United States Congress his budget for fiscal year 1999. In that budget the President proposed to increase spending by $150 billion over the next 5 years, including an actual net increase of $15 billion, that is 3.9 percent, in fiscal year 1999 alone.

Mr. Speaker, the President called for, and this is the thing that I just could not believe, after we have gone through a bipartisan compromise on bringing a balanced budget to this floor last year, the President called for 85 new spending programs, in other words, creating new programs, including, and this is the part that is so bad, 39 new entitlement programs. And we have been trying to turn around this myriad of entitlement programs that have been implemented in this Congress under Democrat control for the past 40 years.

These entitlement programs alone add $53 billion to Federal spending over the next 5 years in new entitlements. Not only is that for the next 5 years but, because they are entitlement programs, they go on forever and ever.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, the President's declaration that the era of big government is over somehow slipped his mind when he presented Congress with this latest attempt to reach into the pockets of the American people.

While the President's renewed commitment to big government is alarming to America's families and businesses, his renewed affection for tax increases, in my opinion, is just intolerable. Just 6 months ago, the President proposed $130 billion in new tax increases and user fees. From the President and his Democratic friends in Congress who passed the largest tax increase, without my vote, in history in 1993, $240 billion worth, as a matter of fact, new Democrat tax increases should, I guess, come as no surprise.

When a liberal Democrat has the urge to tax and to spend in his blood, not even a blood transfusion or a revolutionary election can drain it out of him, I guess. Whenever the liberals need more money for a new government idea, they just turn to the pockets of the American people and American families to foot the bill.

Mr. Speaker, today the American people have the opportunity to speak out on this return to the good old boy Democrat budgeting philosophy of saying no to nobody and yes to everybody, no to nobody and yes to everybody. That is how we got ourselves into this unconscionable sea of red ink, saddling our children, our grandchildren, with $5.5 trillion in debt, even though the Democrat-controlled Congress was reaching deeper and deeper and deeper into the pockets of the American people.

I recall back in the years of Ronald Reagan when we cut taxes and we put money back into the pockets of the American people. We actually doubled the Federal revenues coming into this Congress. But guess what happened? Congress spent every nickel of the amount, double, I think. If I recall back then, it was like $600 million and it went up to a trillion $100 million, and we managed to not only spend the new money coming in but to spend about 2 percent more on top of that.

Mr. Speaker, for the past few days this House has been debating this budget which will govern this Nation's finances for the coming year and also set the tone for future years down the road, at least for the next 4 years. It should be pointed out that the missing participants in this debate have been key portions of the President's budget. The President's budget is not here. It is not on this floor. It is not incorporated into even the Democrat substitute that is going to be on the floor later today.

Mr. Speaker, to highlight the differences in the overall philosophy and the overall vision between we Republicans who oppose tax increases with all our heart and President Clinton and his liberal Democrats who, every 5 minutes, it seems, try to sneak in another tax, try to reach deeper and deeper into the pockets of the American people, today, and that is why it is unusual for this Member of Congress, who has never voted for a tax increase and who has never, certainly, sponsored a bill with a tax increase, it is why I bring to the floor today President Clinton's $130 billion of tax increases and user fees back into this debate, because that needs to be here to show the differences between our two parties.

The bill before us this morning, the Clinton Democrat User Fee Act of 1998, which contains over 100 pages of user fees and tax increases on the American people proposed by the President, Members ought to come down here and look at this, this is 100 pages of fee increases, 100 pages.

Listen to just a brief, I am not going to take the time to read 100 pages of these proposed fee increases, but listen to just this few of some of the 36 discretionary and mandatory user fees worth $25 billion.

Federal Aviation Administration fees, who do Members think is going to pay for that? It is going to be the American people. Bank examination fees; patent and trademark fees going to increase the cost of every product in America today; National Transportation Safety Board fees; farm service fees, going to pile more costs on America's farmers; grain inspection fees; administration licensing fees. I cannot figure out even what those things are, but all I know is it takes money out of the pockets of somebody.

Animal implant service fees; wetland permit fees. These are all increases now that are going to take effect. Fishery management fees; Social Security claimant fees. Here we are going to take more money from senior citizens. National park interests and concession fees are going to skyrocket. Pesticide registration fees, that is not even specified so I cannot tell what that really is. And then, worst of all, Medicare provider fees.

Mr. Speaker, the list goes on and on and on and on and on for 100 pages here.

If Members listened closely to what I have just been saying, they would have seen that the President proposed to increase user fees issued by eight different Cabinet departments, that is practically all of them out there, and three other major government agencies like the EPA and the Social Security Administration.

There are fee increases on farmers. There are fee increases on landowners, on fishermen, on entrepreneurs who are small businessmen with great ideas who start a business, and they are the ones that create 75 percent of all the new jobs in America every single year, not only for displaced Americans who have been caught up in downsizing, but it also includes young girls and boys coming out of high school and college today.

There are fees on physicians, on just plain employees, on emergency personnel. These are voluntary emergency personnel, people that volunteer their time, things that we Americans are noted for. There are more fees on banks. And what do you think that does? That is going to drive up the cost, again, of doing business with banks.

On national park users, I have got a series of national parks in my district, including the Saratoga National Battlefield, which was the turning point of the Revolutionary War.

Incidentally, while I am just speaking, we have got the Medal of Honor, the Congressional Medal of Honor Society convention with about 100 Medal of Honor recipients coming up to Saratoga Battlefield this weekend. We are going to give an award to a great American and his wife, and those great Americans are former Senator Bob Dole and his wife. I just hope we can get out of here in time for me to catch a plane to go up there and enjoy that dinner and see it tonight.

Mr. Speaker, the last one I did not mention was senior citizens, who just get socked with almost every one of these fees.

User fees are nothing more than a back-door hidden way to raise taxes. As a result, taxpayers have less money in their pockets, and the government has more money to spend. If Members believe in that, I guess they want to come over here and vote for this bill. The American people, in my opinion, contribute enough in taxes to the Federal Government; and imposing user fees is just another way, again, a back-door attempt to raise taxes to reach into their pockets.

☐ 0915

What makes President Clinton's user fees especially objectionable? All of you, and I know you are all sincere, and you all were trying to work for this balanced budget, but what makes it especially objectionable is that he uses them as a budgetary gimmick to circumvent the intended discipline of the discretionary spending caps that were an essential part of the balanced budget agreement last year, that we all worked so hard to put together so we could end this further accumulation of this sea of red ink. The President had the opportunity to reform or terminate thousands of Federal programs. Yet out of a $1.7 trillion budget, there are practically no cutbacks there at all in his budget.

Without these fees and without these taxes, the President's discretionary spending would be $5 billion over the discretionary spending caps in fiscal year 1999, and it would be $42 billion over the spending caps over the next 5 years. That is probably hard for the average American person out there to understand when you start talking about spending caps, but it is very, very important because it puts a control on this Congress. It does not allow us to go and spend more. Now we are just throwing that out the window. This means that the President used these user fees as a way to avoid the spending caps established in law, and he can do it. In my opinion it is legal thievery, but he can do it. Mr. Speaker, this is not according to me. This is according to the Congressional Budget Office. Sometime later on today when we get back on the budget that we are debating, Members ought to get the Congressional Budget Office report and they will verify everything that I have just said.

Mr. Speaker, that is the bad news. Now, if you want to hear the worst news, it is the second part of the bill that I just introduced.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, in the Republican budget, there are still $11 billion of user fees, flood insurance, homebuyers for FHA, air travelers, barge traffic on inland waterways, veterans seeking housing, health insurance for civil servants. Would the gentleman join with me to remove those user fees that are in the Republican budget? I would like to help him.

Mr. SOLOMON. I sure would. Let us talk about it.

Now, let us get on to the worst part of the news, because these are real taxes. These are real tax increases. Mr. Speaker, for instance, this bill before us, which I took from the President's budget, every word, I have not added anything to it, so it is actually excerpts from the President's budget, contains the 41 different tax increases totaling $33 billion that was proposed by the President.

Let us just look at some of those. Eliminating the dividends received for certain stock. What did we do? We just reduced the capital gains stock which did more to spur this economy with people that have worked all their lives working for Sears Roebuck, a couple with not much salary all those years but they had some stock saved over that time. Now they can sell that stock, without giving it all to the Federal Government. They can keep 80 percent of it now and in some cases 90 percent and here we are fooling around with this thing again. Defer the interest deduction on convertible debt. Change life insurance rules. You ought to look at those, ladies and gentlemen. Changes in the estate and gift taxes. In other words, stick it to the heirs of the deceased. What did we just do? We just rewrote the laws so that people who have worked all their lives, like I intend to do, and I want to leave a little bit to my five children and my six grandchildren, and now you are going to take it back away again? It gets upsetting.

Reduce the depreciation method for tax-exempt property. What does that mean? That means churches, it means Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, philanthropies. Increased taxes on real estate. We have just about ruined the real estate market in this country as it is. That hurts jobs. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) sitting over there represents a blue collar district. We need to do all we can to create jobs, especially in the construction and building industries. Here we are going to upset that.

Mr. Speaker, the list just goes on and on and on forever, like I said, more than 100 pages. These proposals would have significant impacts on real people, real American people. Take, for instance, one of these tax increases, the President's proposal to raise taxes on financial products which encourage long-term investment and savings. That is terrible.

It is incredible that the President, who is fully aware, he is no dummy, he is one of the most astute, smartest Presidents this country has ever had, he is a Rhodes scholar or one of those guys over there, sometimes they are too smart, but he is fully aware of the impending crisis in Social Security, that it would propose to hike taxes on the products that the American families and business use to plan their own retirements. I see some of you Ways and Means types over here who are grappling with that now. Here is one sitting over here. We need to do all we can to encourage savings by the American people. Millions of American families use these very life insurance products to save for their retirement. Surveys show that many moderate-income families use private sector retirement products such as annuities to plan for their future. This is so important. In fact, many of the owners of annuities are women, 55 percent of them are married, and 28 more percent of them are widowed. Here we are going to take away their savings? The President proposes to increase the tax burden on these same annuities, annuities that 85 percent of the owners intend to use as a fundamental source of their retirement savings. Why should the government discourage these families from saving their money?

We have to remember that every time an American puts a dollar into the bank or puts it into some kind of savings, that creates jobs, because it makes more money available for the private sector to be able to borrow in competition with all of these governments.

The Federal Government. We pay about $270 billion in interest on the accumulated Federal debt today. Then when we look at the State governments and we look at all the counties, towns, cities and villages and their debt, they are all in competition with the private sector. We should be doing everything we can to encourage the American people to save not only for their retirement but because it stimulates the economy.

Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying around this town, ''Don't tax me, don't tax thee, tax that man behind the tree.'' President Clinton's budget enhances his legacy of tax increases with $130 billion in new user fees on taxes on everybody and everything, including that tree, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, with the President's mid-session budget report issued just last week reporting that the tax burden as a percentage of the economy will reach an historic peacetime high of 20.5 percent and remain above 20 percent for as far as the eye can see, this House should resoundingly vote down President Clinton's tax increases right now, today, and shed the light on this President who cannot seem to take enough of Americans' hard-earned money.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. MOAKLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I really think that some of my Republican colleagues are very embarrassed because of the sham bill that is coming to the floor. The person who brought it to the floor readily admitted to everybody he is opposed to it. I am opposed to it. The President is opposed to it. So what is it doing here? It is just another way to try to embarrass the President.

Yesterday my colleague from New York introduced this bill which includes an assortment of revenue raisers, but it omits the programs from the President's budget. Under normal circumstances, Mr. Speaker, this bill would have been referred to six different committees for the consideration and, after research and hearings, possibly brought to the House floor for a vote.

But, Mr. Speaker, that did not happen on this bill. That did not happen because the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) really does not want this bill to pass, and neither do I. In fact, my Republican colleagues want this half-a-bill to lose, and lose badly. Why? In order to deflect attention away from their heartless budget cuts.

My Republican colleagues are so embarrassed by their own budget that they needed to create an even worse one to hide behind for the evening news. My Republican colleagues do not want to stand behind their budget cuts because, and we have heard the litany of cuts, of the increases that the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) talked about, their budget cuts Medicaid, their budget cuts their very own welfare-to-work program, their budget cuts Head Start, their budget cuts veterans' health care once again, and it cuts Superfund cleanups, it cuts children's health care and it cuts school lunches.

We do not talk about that. We just talk about what the President talked about but did not bring to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, these are very serious cuts. These are very serious cuts in the programs that the people of the United States of America really want. I can understand why my Republican colleagues are embarrassed by their budget, but today's bill is irresponsibility at its highest.

I would like to make something perfectly clear. President Clinton does not want this bill. In fact, this bill is such a perversion that President Clinton opposes this bill and quite truthfully, I would tell him to veto it if it were to pass.

I have just received a letter from the acting director of the Office of Management and Budget. The last paragraph, it says, ''H.R. 3989,'' that is the bill we are talking about, ''does not reflect the policies of the President's budget, and the Administration opposes its enactment. We regret that diversionary measures such as this one are being presented for consideration at a time when so much more important work remains for the Congress to complete.'' Signed Jack Lew, acting director, Office of Management and Budget.

Mr. Speaker, my Republican colleagues are so opposed to revenue raises, I wonder how they will bring themselves to support the Republican budget which itself contains $10 billion in user fees. That is right, Mr. Speaker, the Kasich budget imposes $10 billion in user fees on the same American people that the gentleman from New York is so concerned about.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, any budget that meets the requirements of last year's balanced budget agreement must contain provisions to pay for each program expansion.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is ridiculous. It is a sham. When the other side is talking about we have only got so much time to go, why do they bring these things to the floor? For one reason, to try to embarrass the President. This is a political action at its very best. It is being introduced to divert attention away from the Republican budget, not to be passed into law.

I for one give the American people a lot more credit than that. I urge my colleagues to give them more respect. I urge my colleagues to vote against this mockery of a bill, and I am sure the American people will see the diversion for what it really is, pure politics.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,
Washington, DC, June 5, 1998.

Hon. JOE MOAKLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MOAKLEY: Thank you for requesting the Administration's views on H.R. 3989, The User Fee Act of 1998. The President is serious about his commitment to fiscal discipline, and he has proven his commitment by reducing the deficit from $290 billion in 1992 to the first surplus in 29 years. Many Members of Congress have also shown their commitment to fiscal discipline by voting to approve comprehensive deficit reduction bills in 1993 and 1997.

H.R. 3989, however, does not represent serious fiscal discipline. It is instead a cynical diversion from the substantive debate about important budget issues, including the merits of user fees. The Administration's user fee proposal is based on the idea that user fees bring good business practices to the Federal Government by ensuring that the beneficiaries of Government services—not the general taxpayer—pay for them. H.R. 3989 in many cases breaks this link by raising fees without regard to resources for related services.

H.R. 3989 does not reflect the policies in the President's budget, and the Administration opposes its enactment. We regret that diversionary measures such as this one are being presented for consideration at a time when so much important work remains for the Congress to complete.

Sincerely,

JACOB J. LEW,
Acting Director.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK).

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans this morning are doing a rather silly exercise, I think. It is duplicitous, I guess, in its best light. They are trying to take out the user fees and revenue raisers for a separate vote, all except those which they have originated and left in. In other words, they are being selective. They will harm children, health care for the frail elderly, food for the poor. Their own user fees will pay for flood insurance and some homebuyers and air travelers, health insurance for civil servants. But not health insurance for people on Medicare, not health insurance for the poor, not health insurance for children.

It is the same duplicitousness that we heard yesterday, the right-wing religious wackos who were talking about praying. Many of them made a claim to be Christians. What kind of a Christian would harm small children? What kind of a Christian would deny health care to the indigent? What kind of a Christian would deny housing to the poor? I do not know if that is ever mentioned.

For the people on the Republican side whose plan is to destroy programs for the poor and to build their budget on the backs of the poor and then try to convince the American people they are Christians is a lie, it is duplicitous, and it is wrong.

☐ 0930

So as it is this morning, we are wasting our time and the public's time with political posturing for a bankrupt program. Why are we not spending the time this morning to talk about managed care reform? Why not the Norwood bill which 90 Republicans have joined which would give the American public what they want, and that is protection from the unscrupulous insurance companies who are making huge profits by denying managed care to the people paying for it?

Where are the Republicans when it comes to protecting what 80 or 90 percent of the American people want? They are hiding. They are scared. They do not know what to do. They cannot organize to get the kinds of programs that we need.

What about early buying at no cost to the government for those seniors who retire early and will be without Medicare or without health insurance? Why are the Republicans not bringing that part of the President's program to the floor so we can vote on it? Because they do not dare. Because they know that the American public wants programs that will win.

Tobacco legislation; why are the Republicans burying tobacco legislation while we prattle about this silly bill which nobody wants? This is to distract the people from the fact that the Republican cuts in their own budget are so severe that program after program will be destroyed.

The Speaker's desire to see Medicare wither on the vine is being helped by this plan to destroy all assistance to the people who, through no reason of their own, need assistance for a job, for housing, to feed their children. Those will be dismantled, as the Republicans would like to do.

The Kasich budget does not provide the money to fight fraud and abuse. There is about $20 billion in improper payments under the Medicare program. Instead of providing us the funds to monitor that and save them money and cut those bills; 265 million is what it would take for the Medicare program to be able to save a good portion of that 20 billion; instead of cutting the error rate, we are cutting the budgets to the law enforcement people who could save that money.

This Republican budget is pro-fraud. It is on the side of the criminals. That is who the Republicans are coddling with this. Quality will suffer. Nursing homes will go uninspected. So that those of us who are retiring and may want to go to New York or California and seek succor in a nursing home may find them dirty and poorly managed and of low quality because the Republicans are cutting the budget for the people who inspect those and ensure that our parents and our retiring colleagues who will need care in their senior years will not get it.

The bills will be paid slower. Medicare beneficiaries will be unable to get questions answered about the new proposals the Republicans are sending out in the mail.

So that as we see a small amount of money being denied as a way to obfuscate the bankruptcy of the Republican budget, the problems of this country increase, and the leadership on the Republican side continues to do nothing about it.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SOLOMON. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). What is the gentleman's inquiry?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, in my opening remarks about President Clinton I tried to not be disparaging, and I just want to inquire is it appropriate in this House for a Member to accuse other Members, even without mentioning a name, of being religious wackos?

I am looking at a list of Democrats who are good, sincere Democrats that voted for that bill and participated in the debate and there are names like: BAESLER, BARCIA, BERRY, BISHOP, CLEMENT, CONDIT, CRAMER, and it goes on and on and on, and I just do not think that is appropriate or proper, and I hope we can get this debate on a little higher plain.

Is that appropriate or not?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members should avoid personalities in debate directed against other Members.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK).

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that if any wacko in the House would like to raise to a point of personal privilege that the Speaker would be glad to recognize him for that purpose.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I think we should take ourselves out of the fish bowl and think like everyone else. We talk about user fees, service fees, excise taxes, sales taxes, income taxes, estate taxes, capital gains taxes, property taxes, marriage taxes, school taxes, fuel taxes, aviation taxes, old taxes, new taxes, surtaxes and retroactive taxes, so it is no wonder the American people are, in fact, taxed off. How many ways can we tax our country, Congress?

Let us look at the local level, how screwed up this whole situation is:

If someone fixes up their home, they pay more taxes. If they let it go to hell, they get a tax break.

Now let us look at the Federal level: If someone is single, divorced or they abandon their kids, they get a tax break. If they are married and live responsibly, they pay $1,400 a year more and get hit over the head for being a good citizen.

As my colleagues know, this is unbelievable to me.

Now, to make it even worse, the American people are looking back and reading the headlines today and saying, ''With our money Uncle Sam now wants to give more MFN to China and another $10 billion, an additional $10 billion in foreign aid to Russia even though the Russian top financial officer says they stole the last American aid.

Beam me up here. I think it is time to make a common-sense statement to the Congress and the people of the country.

An America that rewards even Communists at the expense of mom and dad is an America that may seem to some to be politically correct but, to me, I submit is downright stupid.

Now I am not voting for anybody's budget. There are more taxes in both budgets than I am for.

I think it is time to dramatize this. I want to see some reasonable trade policy in the country. I want to see a budget that starts rewarding good citizens and stops penalizing achievement.

Mr. Speaker, I think we are all screwed up. So I am opposing the Republican budget. I am opposing the Democrat budget. And in God's name I am asking when will we get a common-sense budget that the American people could all identify with, know where the money goes, why it is going and has a trail that we could monitor and audit?

I think it is very simple, so I am going to support this. I am against the taxes in the President's budget, but I am also going to oppose the taxes and user fees in the Republican budget.

With that, I yield back any common sense left in Congress.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, all of us are going to miss my friend from New York and the chairman of the Committee on Rules. He is leaving this august body with his charm and his wisdom; certainly he is going to leave a vacuum. But I hope he does not put out the legislative lights before he leaves because since we have had a Republican majority the rules of the game as to how we legislate have dramatically changed.

I can understand why the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) keeps yielding to the Democrats: Because hardly any Republican is willing to stand up to defend this thing that has come out of the Committee on Rules.

But I would like to say this, that there used to be a time in the olden, Democratic days where we had standing committees with chairmen and we had senior Republicans. We used to have something, and I forgot the name of it, but I think it was hearings? Yes, hearings. And we used to have witnesses and experts, and they used to testify.

And then along came the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGRICH) and he says, ''You don't need that. You only need one committee, the Committee on Rules. As a matter of fact, we don't need that. All you have to do is have a meeting in the Speaker's office, go upstairs in the middle of the night, find the most complex tax matters that you want, and forget the eight committees that have jurisdiction because, after all, no committees are meeting unless it is to attack the President of the United States. And then have the chairman of the committee introduce a bill in the middle of the night on a Wednesday and make certain that it comes on the floor when nobody is going to be awake in order to do it.''

The only way that they can do this thing, the only way, the new Republican legislative way, they can do this thing is, first, get a budget, and the budget has to make certain that the first thing to do is get a great tax cut for the wealthy people of the United States. Once that is done, then the rest of it is easy.

What is the rest of it? The rest of it is that we will take $101 billion from the committees of jurisdiction. We will not tell them where its coming from. We will let them have the blood on the floor. But we will say, we will say that it should come from health, it should come from education. And, for God's sake, make certain that we do not miss the American veterans. Hit them, and if we miss them, make certain we hit them twice.

Now the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) has indicated, what a modest man, that the tax laws are complicated. Well, it does not take a profile in courage to come to the floor and say that. As a matter of fact, here is the gentleman from New York's list of complicated tax laws. Did he ask the experts in tax laws on the Republican side to take a look at this?

Oh, my chairman is not here, Mr. ARCHER.

Are there any senior Republicans on the Joint Committee on Taxation?

Yes, they are talking.

There are two of them there. There are two Members.

Are we going to have hearings on this, Mr. SOLOMON?

Oh, no, this will not go to hearings.

Why?

It is too complex for the Joint Committee on Taxation to have hearings on it.

The wisdom in legislation is confined now to two areas; one to Speaker, and, God knows, any chairman knows that: Do not have hearings on anything that the Speaker does not want to have hearings on. And the second thing is the Committee on Rules.

I really believe that the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) was not selected just because of his good looks and his wisdom but because of his name. The wisdom of Solomon shall prevail on the budget and on the taxes, and he will tell us estate taxes, real estate taxes, financial property, Social Security, woe, woe, woe, this heavy tax system. He figured it all out, my brothers and sisters, my Democrats and Republicans:

Go home, worry not. There is no legislation, there is no hearings, but, God knows, the Social Security of the United States, that, too, shall rest in the wisdom of Solomon on the Committee on Rules after this is over.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman, my best friend, yield?

Mr. RANGEL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, first of all, this bill, everything in it was before the gentleman's committee. He held hearings on it. He personally spoke on it. I have read his remarks.

Secondly, this did not come out of the Committee on Rules. Now wait a minute now. This came directly to the floor under unanimous consent agreed to by the gentleman from New York's minority leadership.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) because, if this did not come out of the Committee on Rules, what in God's name are we doing here in the first place?

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the reason we did not go to the Committee on Rules is because we knew it was just a dilatory tactic, and we did not want to waste another hour on the rule so I gave the gentleman unanimous consent.

Mr. RANGEL. And so now we have really reached the epic in legislation without Members.

I made a mistake. I really thought it was just the Speaker and the Committee on Rules. It is just the Speaker and the Speaker, as a matter of fact. All that must be done is to tell the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) ''For God's sake don't let the members of the Committee on Rules see this. Just come to the floor. Put your name on it. They'll think it was a legitimate process, and we'll have some debate.''

Oh, no. Listen. First of all, we all know this: that these are recommendations made by the President of the United States.

☐ 0945

In the olden days, it was the Committee on Ways and Means that would really legislate and bring it to the floor because of the Constitution, which says that all revenue raisers would emanate from the House of Representatives, and not the Speaker's office and not the office of the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON).

Second, it does not surprise me that this is the way they would like to deal with the President's budget as it relates to paying for services because, God knows, we will never have hearings in talking about what is in the President's budget.

But I understand it all. They are in the majority, and the further away they can get from substantive legislation, the better they can enjoy the comfort that the President's budget and the surpluses have brought to us.

I am so glad to see that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the man who possesses more knowledge on taxes than any Member in the House, has come to the floor, and I hope he is yielded to to explain this tax plan.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just cannot believe what I just heard, because the gentleman would indicate that this Congress never held hearings on the President's budget. I think we held numerous hearings.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER), one of the finest, most-respected Members of this body, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, to maybe enlighten us on this.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I remember over the years when we were in the minority and we had a Republican President in the White House, the Democrat leadership over and over again brought the Republican budget to the floor so we could have a chance to vote on it. Now I see that the leadership on the other side of the aisle does not seem to want us to have an opportunity to vote on the President's proposals, which we are going to give the House an opportunity to do today.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARCHER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the chairman is exactly right. We did. But he is not bringing the President's budget to floor, he is only bringing one piece of it. He is bringing the user fees, not the programs. This is not a fair presentation of the President's budget.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would say to the gentleman that this could well be the first step, but it is an important first step because no additional spending can occur unless these taxes and fees are approved.

Today the House of Representatives has a chance to stand with the taxpayers who want lower taxes, or with the Washington politicians who want higher taxes. It seems to me our choice is simple. The budget that President Clinton submitted to the Congress is a died-in-the-wool, regular old-fashioned, tried-and-true, liberal tax-and-spend scheme.

Today we will be able to vote on 77 of the President's proposed tax hikes and user fees. In total, they raise taxes and fees by more than $51 billion. Think about it, $51 billion. If one believes in big government and providing the means to make the government bigger, then I would say Members should vote for this bill and vote for the President's plan. If one believes in more spending, then vote today for this and vote for the President's plan.

But if one is like I am, and believes that the government is too big and spends too much, then join me in opposing the unnecessary presidential tax hikes. His budget raises taxes on people who are trying to save, especially women and widows who depend on life insurance policies to make ends meet. It penalizes small businesses that are struggling to get by, and it punishes companies that create jobs. It works against our ability to compete overseas in the global marketplace, which is an absolute essential to improving the standard of living of the American workers.

In an era of surpluses as far as we can see, why on earth is President Clinton proposing all these tax hikes? It is because the President still believes that a big government that spends more and does more is the best answer to the people's problems.

I remember the comments of Thomas Jefferson when he was in Paris during the writing of the Constitution, and he wrote to his friend, Madison, and he said, ''Europeans are bred to desire a government that is energetic, that can be felt. Godsend that our Nation never have a government it can feel.'' But apparently the President wants more government that the people can feel.

I stand with Thomas Jefferson. President Clinton obviously believes that a big government that spends more and does more is the best answer to people's problems, a government that is energetic, a government the people can feel. Not so Thomas Jefferson, and not so I.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friends, if ever there was a reason for the Congress to be a different party than the President, this is it. If we are not here to stop the President from raising taxes again, who will be? We need to stop President Clinton before he taxes again. Join with me. Show you are on the side of overtaxed workers of America and vote ''no'' on Clinton's tax hikes.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am a bit puzzled by this debate. If I listened correctly to the other side, they are saying that all of the fees in this resolution are unwarranted.

Now, I guess I would be puzzled that they are saying that with regard to bank examination fees. Are they saying that the depositors who are getting miserable rates of interest and paying exorbitant credit card fees to the bank should also pay for the Federal regulation of the banks, or are they saying there should be no Federal regulation of the banks, like we tried with the savings and loan industry during the Reagan era?

There is a fee for the registration of pesticides. Are they saying that the American people, average taxpayers, should pay for the evaluation of and the registration of the safety of pesticides, or are they saying we should have a pesticide industry that is totally unregulated by the Federal Government, creating and applying whatever it wants, wherever it wants, however it wants, and putting it in our water supply?

I do not believe even the Republicans want to repeal those fees, nor do they believe average working Americans should pay fees for the profits of the pesticide industry or should pay fees for the profits of the banking industry.

But even beyond that, I am extraordinarily puzzled by the inclusion of one of the most onerous fees to come out of Congress and the administration, in my opinion, in the last five years, and that is the fee for those of us who live in the West. Any time we want to drive on, park on, or recreate in our federally owned forests and BLM lands, we have to pay a fee.

Now, the gentleman from New York is always fond of calling us to our consistency and talking about our past votes. I would like to know how the gentleman from New York voted on the two bills that created this fee, both passed by a Republican majority.

H.R. 3019, the balanced budget down payment act, April 25, 1996, I believe the gentleman voted for it, although he would say perhaps he opposed that part. And I believe again the gentleman in all probability voted for H.R. 3610, the Interior appropriations conference report, which I opposed.

Both of those bills created this onerous fee. They came from the proposal of the honorable gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) in this House of Representatives. This is an incredibly onerous fee on the people of the western United States, created by a Republican Congress, passed by a Republican Congress, never having been authorized by the committee on which I sit. That is an outrageous fee. So let us have some consistency around here.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to just say to the previous speaker, boy, do I agree with him. We are going to defeat this bill that has got that fee in there.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished Member from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules for yielding me time, and I welcome the remarks of my friend from Oregon, to the extent that he stands opposed to user fees in the parks. I very much appreciate that. Knowing his reputation for more and more spending and more and more government control, I am very grateful that he joins with me and others to share that concern about fees.

Now, it is very interesting that we take a look at this.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that mischaracterization of my record? The gentleman will not yield?

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, is it proper for a Member to come to the well while one Member is addressing the House? He could also ask from back there.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona may decline to yield.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank the Speaker. We will try to restore some order.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the reason why we see such vociferous protests is because, even in good conscience, my friends on the left cannot abide the fear and smear they are offering this morning.

Now, some of my friends on the left wonder aloud, why this is brought to the floor? Let me attempt to inform them. You see, friends, and Mr. Speaker, it is because words mean something. When the President of the United States came and spoke from the podium behind me here, he offered a budgetary plan that really, in terms of oratory, was a wonderfully crafted speech with all the poll data and all of the driven rhetorical phrases to offer empathy and concern for the American people.

But, you see, we are compelled to go beyond words to check the costs. And in the words of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, my friend from Louisiana, our President promised everything but stronger shoelaces in that State of the Union message. So if he is going to promise, he has got to follow through with a price tag.

Now my dear friend, the ranking member of the committee on which I sit, the Committee on Ways and Means, lamented what he claimed was an absence of hearings. I would direct his attention to an important date, not only in the Hayworth household, but also in this august body, February 25; not only our wedding anniversary at home, but the day we invited the administration in to defend the budget plan of the President.

I recall distinctly the fact that many of our colleagues on the left joined with us. Indeed our colleagues on the left, Mr. Speaker, were most vociferous in objecting to the revenue raisers that would have to come with the President's budget. So I would remind my friend of February 25.

It is just very interesting to take a look at the reality of what the President offered, almost $52 billion in new taxes.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker I yield one minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

(Mr. BENTSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, about eight hours ago in the middle of the night we debated the Republican budget resolution when nobody was around.

I think people in Hawaii watched it, but every place else Americans were probably sleeping. The reason we debated it then is because they do not want to get up and defend it. They do not want to defend the $10 billion in user fees.

In my district they want to double insurance premiums on middle class homeowners, just like they wanted to in 1995 and 1996. They want to raise the user fees for the intercostal waterway, where working men and women move barges and product along the Gulf Coast, by 500 percent. That is a pretty big increase.

What is going on here? The process is broken. The Republican leadership in the House has failed in the budget. It is two months after we were supposed to have come up with a budget. We have ceded the process to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. The gentleman who just spoke in the well speaks about big budget Democrats.

□ 1000

They were rushing to vote to spend $22 billion over the balanced budget agreement and take out of the pockets of the veterans 2 weeks ago. The process is broken. The Republican leadership has failed the House once again.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the very distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, very briefly, this debate is important, because the White House spins the President's budget as a glorious solution of how government can solve problems by spending money. Nobody has talked about where the money comes from. That is the purpose of this debate and vote. Everything in this bill is the President's budget proposal for tax and fee increases.

I think it is important that we look at where the money comes from because it comes out of the pockets of working families in this country. In the President's budget, it takes $129 billion out of those pockets.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD).

(Mr. BOYD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, I guess I just have not been here long enough to be callous to this sort of shenanigans that is going on this morning. But I have to say that I was shocked when I turned on the television and saw that my Committee on Rules chairman, yes, my Committee on Rules chairman, because he is the Committee on Rules chairman of the United States House of Representatives, was bringing to the floor a bill under his name that nobody would vote for, including myself.

With leadership comes a certain amount of responsibility, and I do not understand why, last night, we debated after midnight a piece of legislation, a budget resolution brought to this floor that did not include the highway spending bill that we passed just 2 weeks ago. Now we have to find additional cuts.

Mr. Speaker, also, we were not allowed to work on the Blue Dog budget. I am a Blue Dog, and I vote with the Republican majority on many occasions when I think they are right. But absolutely they are wrong on this case. They did not allow a reasonable Blue Dog budget to be brought to the floor of this House, but today we are bringing this piece of legislation, and I think it is wrong.

I wish my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON), who was born and raised in Florida, well in his retirement; and I know he has a very, very tough job running the floor of this House. I happened to chair the Rules committee in the Florida House, and I think he has failed on this account.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, we are supposed to be talking about the budget this morning. The Republicans are afraid to bring it up and talk about it. They ran into a problem. They were taking $10 billion from Medicare. That was not working. They were afraid, so, instead, they decided to take it out of Function 600 and aim it at welfare reform. They were frantic. So they stabbed in the dark, grabbed for Function 600, but what they have done is to stab in the back welfare reform.

The National Conference of State Legislatures says this: This budget, the Republican budget abrogates an agreement reached between State Legislators, governors, and Congress in 1996 regarding welfare reform.

The National Governors Association, Governors Carper, Engler, Miller, Beasley, Chiles, Leavitt, O'Bannon, Romer, Ridge and Thompson say this about it: We urge you in the strongest terms possible to uphold the historic welfare agreement reached in 1996 and reject any cuts in TANF, Medicaid, or other welfare-related program as part of the budget resolution.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time, which I believe is 4¼ minutes, to the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER), my final speaker.

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, it is very clear what is going on here this morning. The Republican budget process has failed. They cannot reach agreement among themselves, and they have now been forced to cut tens of billions of dollars out of programs serving the most vulnerable people in the United States.

They have chosen in their budget to protect every special interest in the country. They have chosen to protect the chemical companies, the drug companies, the western irrigator water users, the grazers, the oil companies, the timber companies, and the mining companies.

The President thought it might be a better idea that the mining companies in this country pay the American people something, something for the use of their lands. They chose, rather, to cut nutrition programs.

The President thought it made sense that the big timber companies that cost the taxpayers millions of dollars to take the timber off of the public lands pay a little something. They chose, rather, to cut Medicaid.

The President thought it made sense that the oil companies that have been underpaying the taxpayers billions of dollars and admitting to it every day in court, he thought we ought to recover some of that money for the taxpayers. They chose instead to go after Medicaid. They chose instead to go after child nutrition. They chose instead to go after Title I. That is what is going on here, ladies and gentlemen. They have decided to protect the special interests.

The President thought maybe the concessionaires that have made millions of dollars running the concessions in the national parks ought to pay the taxpayers some fair rent for that right. The Republicans have chosen not to do that. They have chosen not to do that. They have chosen, instead, to cut education programs. They have chosen, instead, to cut veterans programs.

That is what their budget is. This is an effort to camouflage the vote that they will have to take later today on their budget that cuts billions of dollars, billions of dollars to the most vulnerable people in this country.

This is not about fees. This is not about the President's budget. This is about trying to get some cover for the Republicans who they have broken the arms to vote for a budget that is essentially bankrupt, a budget where they refuse to put in hard numbers, a budget where they change it in the middle of the night, a budget that is debated here at midnight, covered up by a bill that was never sent to the committee, never sent to the Committee on Rules, and was decided late last night to be brought to this floor.

Why have they done that? Why have they done that? Because, in their budget, they continue to protect the users of the FDA, the drug companies, and the chemical companies, the mining companies, people who are taking billions of dollars away from the taxpayers of this country, off resources owned by you, the American people. They pay no rents for billions of dollars in gold, billions of dollars in platinum, billions of dollars in silver.

The President thought maybe, just maybe, we ought to run the government like a business, and we are entitled to some rent. But the Republicans have chosen, instead, to say, why do we not go after Chapter 1, trying to help disadvantaged kids?

Republicans have said, instead, why do we not go after the income security in this country and have ways and means? Where are they going to take it out of? Unemployment, Medicaid, Social Security. We will leave it up to the Committee on Ways and Means.

This is about choices. This is about choices to be made.

Later today, the Republicans will have the glory of not only voting for the user fees in this bill but voting for all of their cuts also on the vulnerable populations in this country.

This bill ought to be rejected. It is a sham. It is a cheap attempt to camouflage, because the Republicans know they have a very difficult vote coming up this afternoon for their Members. They have been meeting around the clock trying to get enough people together so they could pass their budget. Maybe they have achieved that. Maybe that is why we are on the floor.

But what they do know, they need some diversion so Members can go home and say that somehow they engaged in some great scheme to protect the American people from fees.

These fees are about fees on special interests and people who are extracting wealth from the resources owned by the taxpayers. The fees on the Forest Service were put there by the Republicans last year when they decided every Tom, Dick, and Harry who wants to go out with his family and use the forest is going to have to pay, but not the timber companies. They have chosen the special interests.

The President chose to try to protect the people and make sure that those people who are using America's resources should pay something for that.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the question was raised by a number of the Committee on Ways and Means Members, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) and others, about why did we bring this bill to the floor.

We bring it to the floor for two reasons. One is that the President of the United States, no matter who he is, cannot bring a budget or any portion of it to the floor of this House. It has to be brought by a Member of Congress representing a committee, and the Democrats have failed to do that.

We are attempting to show the difference between we Republicans, who are absolutely, with every fiber in our body, opposed to raising taxes and taking more money out of the pockets of the people, and as opposed to the Democrat view, as represented by President Clinton with more and more and more taxes and fees. That is exactly what this bill does.

The President is proposing $130 billion in new taxes, not to mention $150 billion in new spending. By focusing this debate on this issue this morning before we go to final passage, it is going to show the difference in division of our two parties. That is obvious to the American people.

I know that there is going to be a motion to recommit, and we will just have to wait and see what that is. But I would just hope that we would defeat the motion to recommit at the appropriate time and then defeat this bill.

Let us send a resounding message to the President that the American people, as represented by this Congress, overwhelmingly oppose tax increases and fee increases.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I am increasingly disappointed that Members of the House are presented on an ongoing basis with false legislative choices that distort problems rather than seek to solve them. H.R. 3989 is the latest example of this approach to policymaking, where serious policy questions are demoted to merely political ones. This vote is meaningless when devoid of the larger context of a budget resolution, and everyone here knows that. I refuse to participate in this legislative charade, and I urge my colleagues to do the same. Join me in voting ''present'' on H.R. 3989. The sooner we stop the pointless political gambits, the sooner we can deal with the people's business.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, June 4, 1998, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. MOAKLEY

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the bill, as everyone in the House is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MOAKLEY moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 3989, to the Committee on Ways and Means to report back forthwith with an amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

''It is the sense of the House of Representatives that the following user fees should be enacted as soon as possible:

(1) HOUSING.—

(A) Increase cost to Federal Housing Administration borrowers by ending rebates after mortgage repayment.

(B) Increase National Flood Insurance premiums.

(C) Increase Federal Housing Administration premiums to cover the cost of the multifamily mortgage program.

(2) TRANSPORTATION.—

(A) Establish airport takeoff/landing slot charges.

(B) Increase Federal Inland Waterway System fees to fully recover the costs of operations, maintenance, and new construction.

(3) VETERANS.—

Extend for one year the loan fee for Veterans' Affairs housing loans.

(4) FEDERAL RETIREMENT.—

Raise Federal Employees Health Benefit premiums.''

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) for 5 minutes on his motion.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, my motion to recommit is very simple. Instead of voting on the revenue provisions contained in the President's budget, let us take a vote on the user fees contained in the Kasich budget. We have heard our friends over there saying they are opposed to these fees. Well, let us see.

The Kasich budget contains almost $10.5 billion in user fees, fees on FHA homeowners, fees on airlines, fees on veterans housing loans, fees on inland water users, fees on Federal employees health benefits. There are fees on individuals who participate in the National Flood Insurance Program and, Mr. Speaker, as well as fees on the multifamily mortgage program at the FHA. All of these fees are contained in the Kasich budget.

One thing I have noticed this morning is there has been a lot of talk about revenue provisions that were ripped out of the President's budget. But, Mr. Speaker, the President's budget is not going to be voted on later this morning, the Kasich budget is.

Mr. Speaker, we should not be wasting Members' time by voting on parts of a budget proposal that the House is not even going to consider. The bill proposed by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) is objected to by the President and probably everybody else in the House. Instead, let us take a test vote on the user fees in the Kasich budget, $10.5 billion worth.

I find that ironic that the Republicans are beating their chests about the revenue raises in a bill that is not even going to be considered and strangely silent on the revenue raises that are included in the bill that will be voted on in a matter of hours.

Mr. Speaker, where is the righteous defense of the American taxpayers from the intrusive reach of the Federal Government contained in the Kasich budget? Where is the outrage over the $10.5 billion in user fees being imposed by the Kasich budget on homeowners and veterans?

I suppose it is just too much to expect consistency from my Republican colleagues on this. The desperate urge to score political points is just too strong. My motion to recommit, simply stated, substitutes the Kasich user fee for those proposed by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON).

☐ 1015

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the motion to recommit. I also rise in opposition to the Republican budget.

Mr. Speaker, as my friend, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. JOHN TANNER) pointed out last night, the new Republican majority in 4 years has truly achieved the level of arrogance that it took the Democratic Party 40 years to have in this body. It did not even allow what is the most important vote of the year, the conservative Democratic alternative to be offered.

If Members have followed this session, they will know that every Tuesday has been spent commending this or condemning that, resolutions that have no effect whatsoever. One week out of every month we have not even been in session. Yet, we cannot find the time to debate and have an open amendment process for the most important thing, which is the budget of the United States, so those of us who would rather spend money getting soldiers off of food stamps can, say, maybe take it from things we do not think are as important, like foreign aid, like the $3 billion that a relatively wealthy Nation called Israel will get of our money, but we cannot find the money to get soldiers off of food stamps.

We will not even be given the opportunity to do so because the budget process, first under the Democrats and now under the Republicans, we cannot even offer an amendment on it. That is wrong.

This is still a democracy, Mr. Speaker. The Speaker may do what he wants to keep that from happening, but every one of us represents the same number of people. Every one of us was elected, and every one of us deserves the opportunity to try to set some priorities for this Nation, and not be handed a load of garbage by one side or the other and say vote on it, take it or leave it.

So I am going to vote against the Democratic budget, I am going to vote against the Republican budget, and I am going to hope for once that we will stick together and provide for this Nation an American budget.

But the only way we can do that is to first vote down the Republican budget, vote down the Democratic budget, vote for the motion to recommit, and let us try to get back to what the Founding Fathers truly had in mind, which is making this body a deliberative body of free expression, where the majority rules and not the lobbyists.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). Does the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) rise in opposition to the motion to recommit?

Mr. SOLOMON. I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the Moakley recommittal would prevent this House from casting a resounding vote against the President's tax and fee increases.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGRICH), the Speaker of the House, a man who personifies the Republican vision of no more tax increases.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, let me say, first of all, that I was delighted to watch the impassioned pleas of my liberal friends for higher taxes. There was an intensity, a passion, an emotional commitment to higher taxes that I believe is sincere.

These are friends who voted for the 1993 tax increase, passed only with Democratic votes. These are friends for whom higher taxes is a legitimate moral cause, because the American people, in their judgment, are not smart enough to solve their own problems, and only bigger bureaucracy, more power in Washington, less take-home pay, will lead to the liberal utopia they believe in.

But I have to say to my good friends, I just checked two of the last three speakers on the gentleman's side. They voted against the welfare reform bill. It is not fair to get up here and protect the welfare reform bill we wrote, that we passed, working with our Governors, my good friend, John Engler of Michigan, who was in on Tuesday, when we chatted about what we can get done; my good friend, George Pataki, Governor of New York, with whom I have been talking about what we can get done; my dear friend, Tommy Thompson, Governor of Wisconsin, who was the original leader in the welfare reform movement, talking about what we can get done.

We have found that we on our side are the people who actually worked with Governors to write the welfare reform bill. So to have liberals who always vote for tax increases jump up in defense of a welfare reform plan they opposed, and cite Republican Governors to the Republican majority, is a wonderful piece of oratory, but it is not historically very accurate.

Let us talk about why we brought this vote up today. This is, frankly, a very important point. I would urge every Democrat, every Democrat who wants higher spending——

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I was just wondering, because I read in the paper this morning that those are the same Republican Governors who will be writing a letter against the budget and are concerned about the money coming out of TANF, the welfare reform proposal I opposed.

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me say to my good friend that very often people around the country, when they read the newspaper version of reality, respond to it. But in a recent conference call with the very Governors the gentleman was talking about, they are quite satisfied with where we are going with welfare reform, and I think they will be quite happy with it.

Mr. MILLER of California. They accept the cuts in TANF?

Mr. GINGRICH. I appreciate the gentleman allowing me to clarify that inaccurate report.

Now that the gentleman knows they are not going to be worried about what we are doing, let us go to the heart of why we have raised this particular motion. I think this is a very important issue.

The President sent up $51.9 billion in higher taxes and fees, not counting the tobacco taxes. We took out all the tobacco taxes he sent up, so this is just a straightforward issue on everything else he wanted to raise, $51.9 billion. Later on this year the President is going to come to the Congress and say, I need higher spending. I know I agreed to the budget deal, I know it was a 5-year deal, but I need higher spending.

So I would urge every Democrat, if they want the President to get higher spending later on this fall, they need to vote no on this motion. They need to say, we want $51 billion in higher taxes. We are for bigger government and more taxes.

But if every Democrat votes with us against $51 billion in higher taxes, then I do not think President Clinton has a leg to stand on in coming to a negotiation later and saying, well, I am really for a balanced budget, but by the way, I need more government, I need more programs.

There are 77 tax hikes and user fees in this particular package, 77 tax hikes and user fees. Why? Because President Clinton is calling for 85 new spending programs, including 39 new entitlement programs.

Mr. Speaker, liberals who had the courage in 1993 to raise taxes may well want to vote with the President for higher taxes and bigger government. So I would urge all of my Democratic colleagues who truly want bigger government and higher taxes, vote no on this.

But for those who want to go home and join us and say the Federal Government is too big, it wastes too much money, we can find 1 percent waste, fraud, and error, we can find 1 percent mismanagement, we can find 1 percent unnecessary programs out of an entire Federal Government of $9 trillion, we can find 1 percent, vote with us.

Those who have a better idea, as our good friend, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) suggested he did, then they get to vote against the President. They do not have to vote with us. But do not vote with us to kill these tax increases, and then come back later and say you really want the money, you just did not want to tell the American people.

We are opposed to tax increases. We think the Federal Government is too big, it wastes too much, it has too much power in Washington. We believe taxes are too high and take-home pay is too low.

I am very proud and very confident that the people who brought us welfare reform, the people who brought us a balanced budget, the people who brought us tax cuts, are in fact capable of finding 1 percent waste.

I urge our colleagues, vote no on their motion to recommit, and stop the Clinton tax increases from further burdening the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which the vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 0, nays 416, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 206]

NAYS—416

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Blumenauer

NOT VOTING—17

Buyer
Cooksey
Furse
Gejdenson
Gonzalez
Harman
Houghton
Johnson, E. B.
Kennedy (MA)
Lewis (GA)
McDade
Mollohan
Pelosi
Reyes
Ros-Lehtinen
Schumer
Sessions

□ 1042

Messrs. BROWN of California, ROTHMAN, LEWIS of Kentucky, WATT of North Carolina, LARGENT, GUTKNECHT, HYDE, LANTOS and WATKINS changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, for those of us who sat up last night and watched the interesting debate and slept late this morning on this, is this a sense of the Congress or is this a bill?

□ 1045

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). We are prepared for the question on final passage of the bill.

Mr. HEFNER. I thank the Chair very much.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 15-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 0, nays 421, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 207]

NOES—421

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest

Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Blumenauer

NOT VOTING—12

Furse
Gejdenson
Gonzalez
Houghton
Johnson, E. B.
Kennedy (MA)
Largent
Lewis (GA)
McDade
Mollohan
Ros-Lehtinen
Schumer

☐ 1104

Mr. RIGGS changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the bill was not passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOBSON). Pursuant to House Resolution 455 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 284.

☐ 1105

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 284) revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 1998, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 1999, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003, with Mr. HEFLEY (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole rose on the legislative day of Thursday, June 4, 1998, all time for general debate had expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 455, the concurrent resolution is considered read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. The amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part 1 of House Report 105–565 is considered as an original concurrent resolution for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule and is considered read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999.

The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998 is hereby revised and replaced and that this is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1999 and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2000 through 2003 are hereby set forth.

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $1,292,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,318,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,331,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,358,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,407,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,452,600,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $0.
Fiscal year 1999: −$4,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: −$10,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: −$21,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: −$28,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: −$37,800,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $1,359,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,408,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,443,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,477,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,502,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,571,200,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $1,343,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,401,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,435,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,463,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,473,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,540,700,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $50,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $83,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $104,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $105,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $65,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $88,100,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $5,436,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $5,597,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $5,777,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $5,957,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $6,102,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $6,269,400,000,000.

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and budget outlays for fiscal years 1998 through 2003 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $267,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $268,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $270,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $265,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $274,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $267,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $280,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $269,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $288,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $272,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $296,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $279,800,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $15,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $14,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $12,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $12,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $12,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $12,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,300,000,000.
(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $18,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $17,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $17,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $17,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $17,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $17,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,700,000,000.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$1,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$6,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$6,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, −$700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,500,000,000.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $24,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $22,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $21,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $20,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $20,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $20,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,500,000,000.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $11,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $12,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $11,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $10,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $10,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $10,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,100,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $7,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $4,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $14,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $14,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $14,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $14,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,000,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $46,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $44,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $43,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $43,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $43,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $43,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,600,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $8,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $8,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $7,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $6,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $6,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $6,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,600,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $61,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $61,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $62,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $63,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $63,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $65,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,900,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $136,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $132,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $143,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $142,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $149,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $149,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $155,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $155,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $162,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $163,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $171,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $172,000,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $199,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $199,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $210,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $211,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $221,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $221,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $239,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $242,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $251,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $248,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $273,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $273,700,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $229,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $234,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $243,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $247,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $255,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $257,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $265,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $264,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $274,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $271,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $284,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $280,400,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $12,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $12,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $13,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $12,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $14,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $15,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,300,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $42,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $42,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $43,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $43,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $43,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $44,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,200,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $25,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $25,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $23,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $22,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $22,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $22,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,600,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $14,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $14,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $13,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $13,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $13,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $13,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,100,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $290,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $290,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $296,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $296,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $297,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $297,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $296,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $296,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $296,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $296,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $298,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $298,500,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, −$14,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$14,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, −$500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$2,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$3,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$2,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$3,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$3,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, −$3,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$3,200,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, −$36,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$36,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, −$36,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$36,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$36,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$36,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$38,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$38,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$45,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$45,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, −$35,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$35,900,000,000.

SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.

(a) SUBMISSIONS.—Not later than June 26, 1998, the House committees named in subsection (b) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(b) INSTRUCTIONS TO HOUSE COMMITTEES.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $30,400,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1999 and $157,400,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(2) COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The House Committee on Banking and Financial Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: −$8,200,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1999 and −$35,100,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(3) COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE.—The House Committee on Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $417,900,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1999 and $2,437,900,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(4) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The House Committee on Education and the Workforce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $18,700,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1999 and $100,400,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(5) COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT.—The House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $71,600,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1999 and $384,000,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(6) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The House Committee on the Judiciary shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $5,200,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1999 and $26,500,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(7) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $16,200,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1999 and $78,900,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(8) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $23,800,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1999 and $125,000,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(9) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—(A) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $411,100,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1999 and $2,374,800,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(B) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of revenues for that committee is not less than: $1,278,500,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 1999 and $6,637,700,000,000 in revenues in fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

SEC. 5. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF COMPENSATION AND PAY FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.

In the House, for purposes of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, establishing on a prospective basis compensation or pay for any office or position in the Government at a specified level, the appropriation for which is provided through annual discretionary appropriations, shall not be considered as providing new entitlement authority or new budget authority.

SEC. 6. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON SOCIAL SECURITY.

It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the trustees of the social security trust funds, should consider issuing marketable interest-bearing securities to the trust funds for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1998.

SEC. 7. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE ASSETS FOR INDEPENDENCE ACT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) 33 percent of all American households have no or negative financial assets and 60 percent of African-American households have no or negative financial assets;

(2) 47 percent of all children in America live in households with no financial assets, including 40 percent of Caucasian children and 75 percent of African-American children;

(3) in order to provide low-income families with more tools for empowerment in lieu of traditional income support and to assist them in becoming more involved in planning their future, new public-private relationships that encourage asset-building should be undertaken;

(4) individual development account programs are successfully demonstrating the ability to assist low-income families in building assets while partnering with community organizations and States in more than 40 public and private experiments nationwide; and

(5) Federal support for a trial demonstration program would greatly assist the creative efforts of existing individual development account experiments.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that legislation should be considered to encourage low-income individuals and families to accumulate assets through contributions to individual development accounts as a means of achieving economic self-sufficiency.

SEC. 8. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON A DEMONSTRATION PROJECT ON CLINICAL CANCER TRIALS.

It is the sense of Congress that legislation should be considered that provides medicare coverage for beneficiaries' participation in clinical cancer trials.

SEC. 9. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE INTERIM PAYMENT SYSTEM FOR HOME HEALTH BENEFITS UNDER MEDICARE.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) there is concern that the interim payment system for home health service has adversely affected some home health care agencies;

(2) the Administration should ensure that the implementation of the interim payment

system does not adversely affect the availability of home health services for medicare beneficiaries;

(3) Congress should carefully examine the Adminstration's implementation of the home health payment system and make any necessary changes to ensure that the needs of medicare beneficiaries are being met; and

(4) the Health Care Financing Administration should quickly implement the prospective payment system that was enacted into law last year.

SEC. 10. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON SPECIAL EDUCATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) Federal courts have found that children with disabilities are guaranteed an equal opportunity to an education under the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution;

(2) Congress responded to these court decisions by enacting the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to ensure free and appropriate public education for children with disabilities;

(3) IDEA authorizes the Federal Government to provide 40 percent of the average per pupil expenditure for children with disabilities;

(4) the Federal Government has not fully funded IDEA at its authorized levels; and

(5) if the Federal Government fully funds IDEA, then local school districts will have the flexibility to invest in new technology, hire additional teachers, and purchase books and supplies.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Federal Government should fully fund programs authorized under IDEA and that such funding is of the highest priority among Federal education programs.

SEC. 11. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON BUDGETARY RULES AND TAX CUTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) in 1990, pay-as-you-go (PAYGO) requirements were enacted to prevent Congress and the President from increasing the deficit;

(2) under PAYGO requirements, tax legislation must be offset by legislation increasing revenues or reducing entitlement spending;

(3) these requirements prevent Congress from offsetting tax cuts with discretionary savings or budget surpluses;

(4) the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 will produce the first surplus in the unified budget in 29 years;

(5) under current trends, the Federal Government could run an on-budget surplus (which excludes social security and the postal service) as early as fiscal year 1999; and

(6) while these requirements were useful during a period of chronic deficit spending, they now limit the ability of Congress to allow taxpayers to retain more of their own money.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the reconciliation bill to be considered pursuant to the reconciliation instructions in section 4—

(1) should permit discretionary savings to be used to offset tax cuts; and

(2) may make on-budget surpluses available to offset tax cuts.

SEC. 12. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON TAX RELIEF.

It is the sense of Congress that the revenue levels set forth in this resolution are predicated on—

(1) eliminating the marriage penalty over an appropriate period of time; and

(2) providing tax relief targeted at relieving the tax burden on families, estates, and wages, as well as incentives to stimulate job creation and economic growth.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. No amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute is in order except the amendments printed in part 2 of that report. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

It is now in order to consider amendment number 1 printed in part 2 of House Report 105–565.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. NEUMANN

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Part 2 amendment No. 1 in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. NEUMANN:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SECTION 101. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999.

The Congress declares that this is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1999 and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2000 through 2003 are hereby set forth.

SEC. 102. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1999: $1,304,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,314,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,348,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,399,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,452,300,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 1999: −$18,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: −$27,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: −$31,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: −$36,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: −$38,000,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1999: $1,385,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,409,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,448,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,426,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,545,600,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1999: $1,377,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,401,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,433,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,443,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,513,100,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 1999: $73,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $87,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $85,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $43,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $60,800,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 1999: $5,596,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $5,777,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $5,957,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $6,102,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $6,269,300,000,000.

SEC. 103. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and budget outlays for fiscal years 1999 through 2003 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $278,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $273,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $283,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $277,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $301,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $289,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $315,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $297,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $324,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $306,000,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $13,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $11,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $11,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $12,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $12,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,100,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $16,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $16,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $16,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $16,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $16,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,900,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, −$1,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$1,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$2,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$3,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$6,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$6,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, −$1,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$3,100,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $19,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $17,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $17,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $16,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $17,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,200,000,000.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $11,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $10,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $10,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $9,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $9,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,000,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $3,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $8,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $8,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $9,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $10,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,000,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $45,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $48,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $50,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $51,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $53,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,100,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $8,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $7,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $6,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $6,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $6,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,600,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $60,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $60,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $60,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $61,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $65,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,000,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $139,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $137,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $141,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $141,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $144,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $144,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $146,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $147,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $151,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $152,400,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $209,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $210,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $220,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $219,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $237,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $240,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $248,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $246,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $270,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $270,400,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $236,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $240,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $245,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $247,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $254,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $254,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $214,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $259,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $271,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $268,300,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $12,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $13,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $12,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $14,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $15,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,300,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $42,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $43,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $43,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $43,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $44,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,200,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $24,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $22,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $22,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $21,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $21,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,600,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $14,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $13,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $12,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $12,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $11,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,600,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $244,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $244,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $238,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $238,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $230,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $230,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $223,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $223,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $217,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $217,400,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, −$3,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$3,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$4,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$4,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$9,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$9,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$9,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, −$6,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$6,000,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, −$44,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$44,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$44,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$44,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$46,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$46,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$54,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$54,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, −$46,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$46,300,000,000.

TITLE II—SENSE OF HOUSE PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING SOCIAL SECURITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The social security program currently collects more in taxes than it pays out in benefits to our country's senior citizens.

(2) Taxes collected exclusively for the social security program should not be spent on any other program.

(3) Social security benefits are expected to consistently exceed social security payroll taxes starting in 2013.

(4) Congress should avoid increasing taxes, increasing borrowing, raising the retirement age, or cutting social security cost-of-living adjustments to pay social security benefits.

(5) Negotiable treasury bonds are safe, real assets that can be sold for cash when income to the social security trust funds is not sufficient to pay benefits for seniors in 2013.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that—

(1) the amount by which social security payroll taxes exceed social security benefits paid shall be invested in negotiable treasury bonds issued by the United States Government and should not be counted as surplus dollars; and

(2) such negotiable Treasury bonds should be redeemable at any time at the purchase price.

SEC. 202. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING TAX RELIEF.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that this concurrent resolution dedicates $150,000,000,000 over 5 years to reduce the tax burden on American families.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that these funds should be used to—

(1) provide across-the-board tax relief by expanding the 15 percent tax bracket by 15 percent for married individuals (whether filing a joint or separate return), heads of households, and unmarried individuals;

(2) eliminate the marriage penalty by making the joint income threshold exactly double that of the individual income threshold in all tax brackets and by making the standard deduction for joint filers exactly double that of individual filers;

(3) restore the 12-month holding period on capital gains; and

(4) eliminate the ''death tax''.

SEC. 203. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING THE BUDGET SURPLUS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The Congressional Budget Office in its Spring projections has underestimated the revenues collected by the Federal Government for the last 3 years.

(2) The United States is experiencing remarkable economic growth with no signs of an economic slowdown because the Federal Government is borrowing less from the private sector.

(3) Revenues to the Federal Government are growing at an annual rate far greater than projected by the Congressional Budget Office in March 1998.

(4) The Federal Government will likely receive significantly more revenues in fiscal years 1999 through 2003 than projected by the Congressional Budget Office in March 1998.

(5) Revenues received above and beyond those projected by the Congressional Budget Office in March 1998 should not be spent to create more ineffective Washington programs.

(6) Additional revenues come from American families who are forced to give far too much of their hard-earned income to the Federal Government.

(7) Working Americans deserve to keep more of their income instead of sending it to Washington, D.C., for Congress to spend.

(8) Congress irresponsibly spent more than it received over the last 30 years, creating $5,500,000,000,000 Federal debt.

(9) The Congress and the President have a basic moral and ethical responsibility to future generations to repay the Federal debt, including money borrowed from the social security trust funds.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that—

(1) any additional revenues collected by the Federal Government above and beyond the Congressional Budget Office March 1998 projections for fiscal years 1999 through 2003 should be divided equally and used to reduce taxes on American families and to pay off the $5,500,000,000,000 Federal debt, prioritizing social security;

(2) such tax reductions should be enacted in the following order—

(A) expand education individual retirement accounts;

(B) index capital gains to the rate of inflation;

(C) immediate 100 percent deduction for health insurance premiums for employees and self-employed;

(D) eliminate social security earnings limit;

(E) repeal 1993 tax increase on social security benefits;

(F) repeal the alternative minimum tax for individuals and corporations; and

(G) permanently extend the research and development tax credit; and

(3) efforts to repay the Federal debt should begin by replacing the nonnegotiable Treasury bonds, in the social security trust fund with marketable Treasury bills redeemable at any time for the purchase price.

SEC. 204. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING TAXES AND DISCRETIONARY SPENDING.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) American taxpayers pay too much in taxes to support a Federal Government which is too large.

(2) Taxpayers should benefit from any changes in law which reduce Federal Government spending.

(3) Current law prohibits savings from reduced discretionary spending from being passed along to the American people through a reduction in their tax burden.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that budget laws should be changed to allow discretionary spending reductions to be dedicated to tax relief.

SEC. 205. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING PUTTING SOCIAL SECURITY FIRST.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The President has encouraged the Congress to put social security first by not spending expected unified budget surpluses, though the Congressional Budget Office estimates that the President's budget for fiscal year 1999 does spend unified budget surpluses.

(2) The Congress currently has no method for dedicating savings from amendments to appropriation bills for the purpose of putting social security first.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that the Congress should establish a procedure that would allow amendments to appropriation bills to dedicate all budget savings to the President's plan to put social security first.

SEC. 206. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING EDUCATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Children in the United States should be the best students in the world.

(2) Quality education for our children will ensure the United States can compete effectively in the global marketplace.

(3) Today's students must learn the knowledge and skills which will lead the world in the next century.

(4) Involving parents in the education of their children increases children's success at school.

(5) Recent studies by the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development show that increased parental involvement in children's lives leads to fewer teen pregnancies, less drug use, lower crime rates, and improved learning.

(6) Education is, and should remain, primarily a State and local responsibility.

(7) It is important to let community members offer suggestions to improve academic achievement within local schools.

(8) The Federal role in education has failed to produce the desired results.

(9) Federal regulations and paperwork consume too much of teachers' and administrators' time and energy, as well as taxpayer dollars which could be used to improve education.

(10) Creating a national testing program would increase the Federal burden on local schools.

(11) State, local, and private schools deserve flexibility which will allow them to meet the educational needs of children.

(12) Increasing the role of parents, teachers, and local community members will improve local schools.

(13) There is not a significant relationship between Federal education spending and academic achievement.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that—

(1) the Department of Education, States, and local educational agencies should spend at least 95 percent of Federal education tax dollars in our children's classrooms;

(2) the Goals 2000 program should be terminated, and funds should be given directly to States and local school districts;

(3) the Congress should enact legislation to prevent the development and administration of a national testing program; and

(4) the Department of Education should limit its role in education to functions which cannot be performed by State or local school officials.

SEC. 207. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING SCHOOL CHOICE FOR THE CHILDREN OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Children in our Nation's capital deserve to have the best education available.

(2) Many parents in the District of Columbia would prefer to send their children to the school of their choice, whether public, private, religious, or home.

(3) Allowing parents to evaluate and choose the proper school for their children gives them an invested interest in helping their children succeed.

(4) Giving children an opportunity to attend the school which best meets their needs will best prepare them for the future.

(5) Letting parents choose a school which reflects the moral or religious beliefs of their children will enhance the children's character and learning experience.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that there should be a Federal pilot program to provide low-income children in the District of Columbia with the opportunity to attend the public, private, religious, or home school of their parents' choice.

SEC. 208. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTIONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Partial-birth abortions allow a child to be delivered until only its head remains in the birth canal.

(2) Partial-birth abortions involve piercing the child's skull and removing its brain.

(3) A large majority of Americans object to partially delivering a child and then killing it.

(4) Both Houses of Congress have consistently supported legislation to ban partial-birth abortions.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that partial-birth abortions should be banned in the United States unless such a procedure is needed to save the life of the mother.

SEC. 209. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING FEDERAL GOVERNMENT-SPONSORED PROMOTION OF ABORTION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Title X of the Public Health Service Act was enacted to help reduce the unplanned pregnancy rate, especially among teenagers.

(2) Title X has not only failed to reduce the teenage pregnancy rate, out-of-wedlock births, and sexually transmitted diseases, it has made these problems worse.

(3) Taxpayer-funded title X family planning clinics are currently required to counsel pregnant girls and women about all of their ''pregnancy management options'', including abortion.

(4) Title X clinics also require clinic staff, following such ''counseling,'' to refer girls and women who want an abortion to clinics that perform them.

(5) Many of these abortion clinics are operated by the same organizations that operate title X clinics.

(6) The United States Government through title X is using taxpayer dollars to subsidize activities destructive to human life.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that taxpayer dollars should not be used to subsidize abortion or organizations that promote or perform abortions.

SEC. 210. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING TITLE X FUNDING.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The title X of the Public Health Service Act family planning program provides contraceptives, treatment for sexually transmitted diseases, and sexual counseling to minors without parental consent or notification.

(2) Almost 1,500,000 American minors receive title X family planning services each year.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that organizations or businesses which receive funds through Federal programs should obtain parental consent or confirmation of parental notification before contraceptives are provided to a minor.

SEC. 211. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING INTERNATIONAL POPULATION CONTROL PROGRAMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) There is international consensus that under no circumstances should abortion be promoted as a method of family planning.

(2) The United States provides the largest percentage of population control assistance among donor nations.

(3) The activities of private organizations supported by United States taxpayers are a reflection of United States priorities in developing countries, and United States funds allow these organizations to expand their programs and influence.

(4) The United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) recently signed a 4-year, $20,000,000 contract with the People's Republic of China (PRC) which persists in coercing its people to obtain abortions and undergo involuntary sterilizations.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that—

(1) United States taxpayers should not be forced to support international family planning programs;

(2) if the Congress is unwilling to stop supporting international family planning programs with taxpayer dollars, the Congress should limit such support to organizations that certify they will not perform, or lobby for the legalization of, abortions in other countries; and

(3) United States taxpayers should not be forced to support the United Nations Populations Fund (UNFPA) if it is conducting activities in the People's Republic of China (PRC) and the PRC's population control program continues to utilize coercive abortion.

SEC. 212. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING HUMAN EMBRYO RESEARCH.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Human life is a precious resource which should not be created or destroyed simply for scientific experiments.

(2) A human embryo is a human being that must be accorded the moral status of a person from the time of fertilization.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that Congress should prohibit the use of taxpayer dollars for the creation of human embryos for research purposes and research in which human embryos are knowingly destroyed.

SEC. 213. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING HUMAN CLONING.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Scientists around the world are actively participating in experiments which attempt to clone animals.

(2) Several of these experiments have succeeded in creating genetic clones of animals.

(3) The technology used in such experiments could be used to create genetically identical human beings;

(4) It is unethical and immoral to experiment with the creation of human life.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that any research on the cloning of humans should by prohibited by Federal law.

SEC. 214. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING TRADITIONAL MARRIAGES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Traditional marriages consist of one man and one woman.

(2) Strong families are the cornerstone of our society and our country.

(3) Children benefit from strong families.

(4) The Congress passed and the President signed into law legislation defining marriage as the union between one man and one woman for purposes of Federal programs.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that future legislation and regulations should recognize the importance of the traditional family in the United States.

SEC. 215. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The Federal Government's involvement in funding for the arts has become increasingly controversial.

(2) Millions of United States taxpayers have been forced to support both artists and organizations to which they object.

(3) The National Endowment for the Arts, despite congressional instructions to avoid controversial subject matters, continues to subsidize offensive art.

(4) More than 99 percent of funding for the arts is obtained from private sources.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that funding for the National Endowment for the Arts should be eliminated.

SEC. 216. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING FOREIGN AID.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The nation of Israel has been a reliable and dependable ally to the United States.

(2) The United States' support for Israel is vital to achieving peace in the Middle East.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that aid to Israel should not be reduced.

SEC. 217. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) One of the most basic human rights is the right to religious freedom.

(2) The United States has a strong history of protecting individuals' right to religious liberty and encouraging other countries to do the same.

(3) Recent reports indicate that several countries continue to persecute individuals based on their religious beliefs.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that the United States should encourage other countries to protect religious freedom and allow their citizens to practice the faith that they choose without retribution.

Amend the title so as to read: ''A concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 1999 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003.''.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 455, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. NEUMANN) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. NEUMANN).

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH).

Mr. McINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, the Conservative Action Team, or CATs, was founded to get this Congress back on track with the agenda the American people sent us to achieve in 1994. Today we bring before this House a budget that does exactly that. In fact the CATs budget proposal which the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. NEUMANN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) and others in CATs have worked so hard on is the only conservative budget before this House today. It is the only budget to hold the line on government spending to at or below inflation. It is the only budget that returns $150 billion in tax relief to all Americans, to families and to small businesses. It is the only budget which preserves and protects Social Security by putting real assets into the trust fund, and the only budget that strengthens our national defense.

The American people want us to hold the line on spending. In a recent poll conducted by Kellyanne Fitzpatrick, 90 percent of Americans believe that we should hold the rate of growth of government to inflation or below the rate of inflation. The CATs budget, as this chart shows, is the only budget that holds spending below the rate of inflation, the only balanced budget that reflects that priority of 90 percent of Americans.

The CATs budget saves $280 billion in spending off of the projected levels of spending. Many in Washington call that a cut. However, when you are increasing by 2.6 percent, although it is below the rate of inflation, only in Washington would that be referred to as a cut.

The CATs budget is the only budget to cut taxes. We have $150 billion in tax cuts. It is the only budget that will cut it by that amount. President Clinton in his budget raises taxes by $120 billion. This Congress in the last vote rejected that budget overwhelmingly. The Committee on the Budget cuts taxes by $100 billion. But the CATs budget would provide $150 billion in tax cuts, relief for all Americans, including total elimination of the marriage penalty, an across-the-board tax cut for all Americans by increasing the 15 percent bracket, a cut in capital gains, and elimination of the death taxes.

If the economy continues to grow, the CATs budget will be able to have $480 billion in tax cuts, allowing us full deductibility of health insurance, indexing of capital gains, repealing of the alternative minimum tax, providing for educational savings accounts, and repealing President Clinton's tax increase on Social Security.

The way we do this is by designating 50 percent of any additional revenue collected beyond that projected so that if the economy continues to grow, 50 percent of that extra revenue will go to tax cuts, 50 percent will go to pay off the $5.5 trillion national debt.

The CATs budget addresses the moral imperative of protecting Social Security. One of Washington's dirty little secrets is that Social Security tax surpluses are being set aside and saved for future generations. In reality, for 20 years they have been spent on government programs. The CATs budget puts real assets into the Social Security trust fund by purchasing negotiable Treasury bonds. We put $275 billion in real assets into Social Security.

National security is also a priority in the CATs budget. We make our national defense a priority, because today we read about China being given national security secrets so that they can develop nuclear weapons that will hit every State in the union. India and Pakistan are becoming nuclear powers. Saddam Hussein has been able to thumb his nose at President Clinton who cannot re-create the Gulf War to stop him because we have cut our defenses too much. In fact, President Clinton's defense budget request, $270 billion for next year, represents a 1.1 percent decrease in real terms for defense spending. This is a 39 percent drop from the spending levels of the 1980s. As a result, we hear about jet fighters not able to fly because their parts are being cannibalized, about soldiers training without bullets because there are no supplies, about men and women in our armed forces being sent out on active duty twice as long as during the Cold War because there are not enough ships in our Navy, not enough divisions in our Army, not enough battalions in our Marines and not enough air wings in our Air Force. So critical is this problem that it is now questionable whether we are able to meet our global responsibilities or counter hostile powers in an increasingly unstable and dangerous world. The CATs budget increases defense spending by 56 percent over the budget agreement. This is the amount equal to inflation and would allow America to continue to be the preeminent superpower.

Mr. Chairman, while all of us are pleased with the committee's budget, specifically its commitment to eliminate the marriage penalty, we can do more and we must do more. The CATs budget demonstrates that this is very possible. We make government smaller, we provide overdue tax relief for Americans, we protect Social Security, and we increase spending on national defense.

I urge all of my colleagues and certainly all of my colleagues who wish to call themselves a conservative, vote for the Conservative Action Team budget so that we can put this Congress back on track the way the American people want us to go in this year, 1998. I commend the members of the CATs team who worked on this budget.

☐ 1115

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 7 minutes.

(Mr. SPRATT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I have not had the opportunity to read the Neumann substitute, but I have read the Kasich resolution, and I have read the report that accompanied that resolution, dated May 12, which amplified where the cuts he was proposing might come from.

I would like to pose some questions to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. NEUMANN), the sponsor of this substitute, which I will allow him to answer on his time because I do not have enough myself to grant him, but here are the questions:

I am concerned, interested, curious to know if the gentleman's substitute corrects what I view as some serious faults, defects, shortcomings, inequities in the Kasich resolution. Does he correct these problems or in his zeal for a bigger tax cut does he actually make them worse?

First issue raised on the floor last night: The Kasich resolution delivers America's veterans a double whammy. They have already suffered a $10 to $17 billion extinguishment of their disability rights when in the transportation bill we wiped out their rights to smoking-related disability benefits. And, Mr. Chairman, I will yield at the end, and I will give the gentleman from Wisconsin a list of these things so he can respond to it because it is a rather lengthy list.

The Kasich resolution, despite the fact that the transportation bill has already extinguished those benefits, the Kasich resolution has reconciliation directions in it to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs which calls on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to cut veterans' benefits by another $10 billion. I would like to know if the gentleman's resolution does the same thing or does he correct this gross inequity?

Another point: The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) in a last-minute move shifted $10 billion in cuts from Medicare over to the account known as income security, and we all know where that cut is coming out of. It is coming out of the welfare block grant, the so-called TANF block grant.

The gentleman's governor, Governor Tommy Thompson, wrote a stinging letter yesterday with nine other governors calling that deduction, $10 billion out of the TANF block grant, a breach of the agreement that the Governors made with the Federal Government when they signed off on welfare reform. He and Governor Tom Ridge and Governor Tom Carper and Governor John Engler, 10 governors altogether, have written opposition to that in a stinging letter. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin correct this problem?

Now just a minute ago, another point, the House voted overwhelmingly to denounce the President of the United States for including user fees of various kinds in his budget. As a matter of fact, if my colleagues read the Kasich budget closely, they will find that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) has seven new user fees in his budget. These user fees altogether cost $11 billion. Here is a list of them. I will let my colleague look at them, $11 billion in user fees.

In light of the resolution we just adopted, in light of the motion to recommit, the resolution that we just defeated, does the gentleman include these fees in his budget also, or does he plan to exclude those fees since the House has overwhelmingly said it disapproves of them?

Another point: The Kasich budget cuts energy. It is hard to tell where those cuts are coming from. He wants to abolish the Energy Department. But one of the things he wants to do, according to the May 12 report, is sell at least three power marketing administrations: Southwest and Southeast. And these power marketing administrations have a one-time return to the government of about $3 billion.

Since the gentleman is seeking an additional $50 billion in cuts, does he want to sell not just three power marketing administrations but five or six or all of them? Does he want to sell Bonneville? TVA?

The Kasich resolution also cuts law enforcement, incredibly cuts law enforcement. Here we are seeing a reduction in violent crime persistently over the last 3 to 4 years, and the Kasich budget would cut law enforcement by $8 billion. This would whack the FBI; it would whack the Drug Enforcement Administration. It would mean the end of community policing, a very popular program that has put 80,000 police on the streets of America.

Crimes rates are coming down. Does my colleague want to pull a bunch on crime? Is he going to take $8 billion out of the crime program?

Medicaid. Last year one of the greatest things we did in the balanced budget agreement was balance the budget but show that we could still promote a few priorities, and one of those priorities was children's health care. We created the children's health insurance plan at a cost of about $16 billion.

But the Kasich budget comes along and whacks Medicaid by $12 billion, whacks the health account by that amount. Does that mean we are not going to have a children's health insurance plan? Does the gentleman correct that? Does he provide for children's health insurance? Does the gentleman also want the acute care under Medicaid to be block granted, as Mr. KASICH would, or has he corrected that in his resolution?

There is a gaping hole, in addition, in the Kasich resolution, a black hole, because he does not specify where the increases in the highway spending bill which this House and the Senate have already enacted $48.8 billion in budget authority, $23.3 billion in outlays over the next 5 years. We do not know how that is going to be accommodated. What gets bumped? Displaced? Does the gentleman's resolution clarify this black hole or does he only deepen it? In his zest to go for a $50 billion tax cut, do we now have a $75 billion black hole instead of a $25 billion black hole?

And what about cuts in the environment? That was a protected priority. We listed the amount of money we were spending on environment each year in the balanced budget agreement. Mr. KASICH cuts the environment and natural resources by $4.6 billion. Does the gentleman restore that, or do we also take that out?

And what about education? That was a protected priority. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) would cut education and training, would cut education by $5 billion. One of the truly cockamamie ideas, if my colleagues will, in this May 12 document was the notion of taking title I, one of the most successful programs we have got, a program which takes 95 percent of its money and puts it in the classroom, a program that helps individual kids keep pace with other kids in their peer group, would take that program and convert it from a school grant to a student grant, voucherize the title I program. Would the gentleman do that, or does he correct that particular deficiency?

And basically what I would like to know, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) would in effect add about 6 percent of additional cuts to discretionary spending, nondefense discretionary spending, meaning that overall it would be cut by about 18 percent by the year 2003. Since the gentleman is going for an additional $50 billion in tax cuts, will that be a 30 percent cut in discretionary spending? A 35 percent cut in discretionary spending? Or has the gentleman somehow figured out a way to mitigate cuts that I do not believe will ever be made?

So the bottom line in my request to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. NEUMANN) is does his resolution improve or correct these problems, these discrepancies, in the Kasich resolution, or does he worsen them?

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond briefly.

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) leveled 8 attacks against the Kasich budget and somehow implied they are about the Neumann budget. First of all, they are not. Let me respond to all eight:

False, false, false, false, false, false, false and false.

And let me respond specifically to the first one as it goes to veterans. The Kasich plan, as written, has $6.5 billion more for veterans benefits in the spending category than what was called for in last year's budget agreement that passed through the House and was signed into law.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON).

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, if my colleagues believe their constituents are overtaxed, then they ought to vote for this budget. This budget is the only one that we will debate that puts taxpayers first and stops wasting their money in Washington.

Each year the average American works until May of each year just to pay their taxes. If we add State, local and Federal taxes together, and the average family of four pays almost 40 percent of their income in taxes, that is more than we pay for food, clothing and housing combined.

The American people deserve to have that corrected, and this budget does that.

This conservative action team budget will return to the American people more than $150 billion in their tax money providing across-the-board tax relief, eliminating the marriage penalty, eliminating the estate or death tax and restoring a 12-month holding period on capital gains. The American people need real reform from the crushing burden of taxes, and this budget provides it.

Now we have been talking about defense. This is the only budget that increases our Nation's defense spending by $56 billion in order to just keep up with inflation. No other budget does it.

Recent events in India and Pakistan remind us what history has taught us. Americans cannot ensure economic security for our families unless we have real security in our defense of the Nation. In order to provide security we have got to invest in our Nation's defense. A strong defense is the only way America can remain the No. 1 leader in the world, and this budget is the only one that just barely maintains the defense at just inflation level. It is our duty, in fact it is our primary function, I believe, in this Congress to ensure the security of these United States. Let us do it. It is imperative to our survival. This budget plan returns the most money to hard-working American families, helps preserve the Social Security and shores up our national defense.

As my colleagues know, Americans want, need and deserve tax relief. This is an all American budget and deserves my colleagues' votes.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

(Mr. CARDIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Neumann CAT budget and the Kasich Republican budget and in support of the bipartisan Balanced Budget Act of 1997 which is incorporated in the Spratt substitute.

Last year we worked together, Democrats and Republicans. We produced a balanced budget and a surplus this year, the growth in our economy. Since 1993 we brought the deficits down from $300 billion to now we have a $40 billion plus surplus.

The Republican Kasich budget is a partisan blowup of that agreement. It would return us to large deficits and/or irresponsible, extreme budget cuts.

My Republican friends claim this is just a 1 percent cut in the budget, yet when we look at what they are trying to fund, the hundred billion dollars tax cut, the transportation bill that has already been passed, other spending that the Republicans would increase and the fact that 2 out of every $3 in the Federal budget are exempt from any of these cuts, then most programs are looking at cuts of up to 30 percent and higher. We do not have to guess about that. We have Mr. KASICH's list, which shows us how we need to cut the budget in order to achieve the Kasich budget.

Let me just give my colleagues a sampling of some of the cuts that would be required:

Eliminate the Department of Commerce, and yet at this time when we are trying to increase U.S. products in foreign markets; eliminate the Department of Energy when we are trying to become more energy self-sufficient, and some of us still remember the gasoline lines; jeopardize title I funding for our disabled children, our most vulnerable in our population; cut the Environmental Protection Agency by 15 percent. These are on Mr. KASICH's list. It is not a 1 percent cut.

The welfare-to-work program is jeopardized. Two years ago we successfully worked a partnership with our States and returned the administration of welfare to our States in welfare-to-work, in partnership with the Federal

Government helping provide the dollars so people could get off of welfare to work. This budget reneges on that commitment. It is welfare to nowhere if this budget became law.

To our veterans: Look at the budget document. They take $10 billion out and they do not fund it. We are not meeting our commitments to our veterans today. We should be doing more, not less. The Kasich budget would take $10 billion more unaccountable.

The elimination of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. We have already had that battle here. It has not been agreed to, but yet it is on the Kasich list.

Cops on the beat. I have Democrat and Republican county execs in the Baltimore area applauding our efforts to put more cops on the beat. The Kasich budget would decimate that program, a $6 billion cut in law enforcement, jeopardizing the progress that we have already made in this area.

And the list goes on and on.

This is not a 1 percent cut. If the budget became law, it would destroy many of the programs that are so important. We would be returning to Republican extremism that led to the shutdown of our government.

☐ 1130

Do not take my word for it. We have the comments of the Republican leaders in the other body. Chairman DOMENICI said the budget would make a mockery of the process. Chairman STEVENS said Congress could not function under the plan. These are our Republican leaders in the other body.

Fortunately, we have an alternative. We have the Spratt substitute. I urge my colleagues to vote for the Spratt substitute.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, since my colleagues from the other side seem to have aimed their attacks against the Kasich budget, rather than against our plan, I assume that means they are basically in support of our plan.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, any way they want to try to cook it, they can cook it. But the fact is, think about this for a second, Federal spending is going to go from $7.8 trillion over the last five years to $9.1 trillion over the next five years, and we are arguing that we ought to be able to find a penny out of a dollar from this government.

The American family had a chance to vote on whether the Federal Government can live with $9 trillion, rather than $9.1 trillion. We could help the families to get more, and not cave in to the Washington culture, and not cave in to all the special interest groups that want to keep taking from families.

Then, you know, you actually have to vote against mine. And I am not surprised that the people who for many years have supported running America from the top down, taking more and more money from families to give to government, would oppose this. But it is patently absurd when you even watch the news at night, ''The Fleecing of America,'' to think that we could not squeeze one penny out of a dollar out of this inefficient government.

Let me further say to my colleague who just spoke and some of them who spoke, the President has a budget that increases taxes by $130 billion and increases spending by $150 billion, and they love that plan. They love it, because when the President's man came up to the Committee on the Budget, they supported him.

The fact is, if you think that this biggest, most bloated institution on the face of the earth can save one penny on a dollar and live with only $9 trillion in spending over the next five years, so we can take those savings and help the family and eliminate the marriage penalty, vote for my resolution. If you cannot, frankly, you are living in the past.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE).

(Mr. MINGE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, we have had a great deal of rhetoric this year about the optimistic surplus forecasts for the Federal budget. It is truly a great day if we can say that there is a surplus. But the truth of the matter is that we do not have a surplus, we still have a deficit; we are still in an era of deficit spending.

Why is this? The chart that is right to my right here indicates what is happening. The red line shows the surplus in the Social Security trust account each year. It continues to grow because the baby-boom generation is paying in record amounts for Social Security.

At the same time, that lower line shows the rhetoric, the expectation that we actually have some sort of a surplus in the budget, down here, as much as $4, $5, $8 billion.

The truth of the matter is, this line shows what is actually happening. That is the deficit that we are running.

What does this mean? It means that the attractive, the appealing, and to a certain extent the deceptive promises that we can have new programs, that we can cut taxes, that this will be painless, that somehow the political system will accept these sacrifices that are necessary to achieve these ends, all of this is illusive.

We have worked through the political process here in Congress. We know what the constraints are. We know what our colleagues will accept. Some say we will cut defense; others say we will cut agriculture; others say we will cut education; some say we will just cut waste, fraud and abuse.

But the fact of the matter is, we have to live with the political reality that exists in this Nation, and the fact of the matter is that if we are going to stop deficit spending, if we are going to stop relying on the Social Security Trust Fund to finance other programs of the Federal Government, we are going to have to make some very, very tough decisions.

We are going to have to decide, is it more important to have tax cuts, which all of us want, now, or to defer the gratification? We are going to have to decide, are we going to expand and inaugurate new programs, which almost all of us would like to have, or are we going to defer the gratification?

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that what we need to do is face up to the hard, cold reality that exists. We are still under these budgets borrowing from Social Security, and we are not addressing the very important task of actually bringing our budget into balance.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege to yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on National Security.

(Mr. SPENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Neumann substitute, mainly because it is the only budget we are considering today which increases defense spending. Really, it does not increase defense spending; it just barely keeps up with inflation. I want to repeat that. It barely keeps up with inflation. We need more than that.

We are here debating all these various budget proposals, discussing cutting things and increasing things and all the rest, and the very top priority of our government, any Federal Government, protecting our people, the security of our Nation, is the only thing that is left out. We have our priorities mixed up.

Let me remind Members of something. If you are not aware of it, people need to be reminded: We are at this very minute, not tomorrow, not in the future, at this very minute we are faced with devastating threats from all over this world, and we are unprepared to defend against these threats which threaten our people, our constituents, our troops stationed throughout the world, our allies all over the world. At this very minute we are faced with these threats.

We are faced with threats from China, ICBM's, intercontinental ballistic missiles, with nuclear warheads. We cannot defend against one of them. Even one launched accidentally from somewhere in the world, we cannot defend against it. It would destroy millions of lives in this country and puts the very survival of our Nation at risk, and we cannot defend against it.

In this day and time we have the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction throughout the world. They can be put together in laboratories in inexpensive and low-tech ways. They can be used as warheads on short range missiles or cruise missiles. Cruise missiles can be launched from various platforms, bringing everyone within range of weapons of mass destruction, chemical, biological, bacteriological weapons. Can you imagine what it is like to defend against these? We do not have a defense against them.

Can you conceive of what these things mean to the lives of our people and the very survival of our nation?

Can you conceive of losing 1–3 million people in Washington, DC if 200 pounds of anthrax is released in the air above us?

We have cut our military too much—this is already the 14th consecutive year of budget deductions. Spending for defense has been cut 33%—all other spending, however, has increased.

We have done to our own military what no foreign power has been able to do—tear down the greatest defense of freedom to the extent that it cannot properly defend this country.

I will say this, and I mean what I am saying, and I want people to listen to it: The people who put this Kasich budget together that puts our country at risk are guilty of dereliction of duty.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget claims to cut $100 billion below last year, and this amendment would add $50 billion to it. Yet I have in my hand a sheet of requests from Members to the Committee on Appropriations asking us to add 7,000 items totaling $353 billion above the President's request.

In energy and water, for instance, there are at least 120 Members of the Republican Caucus who have written us asking us for spending above the President's request. In transportation, at least 40 Members on that side of the aisle are asking us to spend money above the President's request. Yet in the generic, they pretend they are going to cut $100 billion here today.

I have just one question, Mr. Chairman. Is that kind of hypocrisy learned, or does it come naturally?

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my good friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I come here to support the Conservative Action Team's budget. Let me say, first of all, there are perhaps three reasons why all Members should consider it. First of all, it has the lowest increase relative to inflation of all the budgets. Second of all, for those folks who want higher defense spending, this budget has it. The third reason is it has a lockbox, a lockbox dealing with the Social Security Trust Fund. As I understand it, it is the only one that has the lockbox, which means any savings in this budget are going right back to the Social Security Trust Fund.

Of course, lastly, for those of us concerned about user fees and taxes, this budget has the most amount of reduction in user fees and taxes. For all of those reasons, I urge my colleagues to support the Conservative Action Team.

We have had a lot of rhetoric on this side, but this budget in fact brings it down home. So you have less taxes, higher defense spending, and, at the same time, a lockbox for Social Security.

Mr. Chairman, the debt is going up in this country. Every year the debt is going up. Yet we talk about a balanced budget. How can the debt go up if we are balancing the budget? Because we are not. We are taking funds from the Social Security Trust Fund, and that is not right. A lockbox and the Conservative Action Team will stop that.

Mr. Chairman. I want to compliment my colleague from Ohio, Chairman KASICH, for his tremendous efforts in bringing his FY '99 budget to the floor today.

While I agree with him that we need to continue placing restraints on spending and provide additional tax relief, I find that the alternative offered by Representatives NEUMANN, MCINTOSH, and JOHNSON, the conservative action team (CAT substitute) is a better way to achieve these goals.

Thomas Jefferson stated: "The same prudence which in private life would forbid our paying our own money for unexplained projects, forbids it in the dispensation of the public money."

The CAT's budget continues to honor our pledge to reduce Government spending without increasing taxes.

This budget alternative chooses family over big Government spending programs.

If Government were forced to pay its bills in the same manner as the citizens who finance it, the bill collectors would be knocking down our doors.

The CAT's budget offers us the opportunity to continue what we started last year by holding down spending and cutting taxes. Together, these two components will ensure that our Nation's economy will continue to experience the growth it is currently enjoying well into the next century.

There is one area of the budget that has me particularly perplexed. That is the way in which we use our Social Security trust fund to pay for other programs. The CAT's substitute doesn't just offer rhetoric when it comes to saving the Social Security trust fund, it provides the necessary safeguards to achieve that goal.

The trust fund is projected to be running a surplus of $100 billion dollars for FY '99, I would hope that we will stop using this fund to mask our Nation's deficit. Instead, let's use a portion of the surplus to replenish the money borrowed from the Social Security trust fund and as the CAT's budget does, let's create a Social Security "lock box" that would prevent any future raiding of the fund.

The Social Security trust fund's surplus shouldn't be used to fund other programs. And it should not be used to mask our Nation's debt.

Mr. Chairman, I am firmly convinced that our Nation's future is tied to the restoration of traditional family values. The Neumann budget addresses this by standing up for human life, increasing the role of the family in education, by cutting taxes, and by increasing our defense budget to keep up with inflation.

There is one additional area that I would like to mention. I want to echo Chairman KASICH's remarks when he stated at the Budget Committee markup that he hoped the appropriators could give the NIH an even bigger boost than the budget recommended. I want to thank him and I appreciate all the excellent efforts of the House Budget Committee members to increase the NIH funding. I respectfully urge them to recede to the Senate Budget resolution on NIH funding for FY '99 when they go to conference. Only progress through health research will truly reduce the costs of programs such as Medicare and Medicaid.

I would be remiss if I didn't mention my commitment to ensuring that our Nation's veterans also receive the necessary funding so that we fulfill the pledge we made to them.

To sum it up, the Neumann budget taxes less, spends less, places restraints on Government growth, provides for a strong defense, restores family values, and dedicates the surpluses to reducing taxes, preserving Social Security and repaying the debt.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman, we keep the surplus intact to save Social Security, and we do not have $11 billion in user fees, as the Kasich resolution does.

Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Neumann amendment and to the Kasich budget resolution. We would like to talk about the budget resolution offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH).

As has been pointed out already today, without any disagreement to the contrary, there is approximately $25 billion in the Kasich budget that is unaccounted for because it has already been spent to pay for the transportation bill. This is the same grave omission that caused many Democrats and Republicans to vote against the transportation bill when it left the House, because it threatened to spend the surplus. That is the grave sin we commit here today. The budget resolution offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) takes us down the road of spending the surplus.

Now, the argument has been made this amounts to a 1 percent cut in spending. There has also been an admission that we are going to spare defense and Medicare. There has been absolutely no response to the very specific points made about how deep the cuts will have to be made in Medicaid, education and other important core functions because of the way the budget resolution has been written.

This is not a day for speeches. This is our day to put a very detailed plan on the floor of the House, and those details are not forthcoming. There is a reason why Republican and Democratic governors are opposing this budget resolution, because those details are missing and because the best work we do here when we are balancing the budget is working with the States. We are ignoring them.

□ 1145

One of the important lessons we should have learned from 1995 is that we are not just talking about numbers here today. We are talking about people's lives, and we are failing to address the impacts these cuts could have on the lives of the people we represent at home.

One thing is perfectly clear, whether this budget resolution passes or not, and that is, it is going to leave us rudderless. We have chosen not to work with the Senate, not to work with the President. As a result, this budget resolution becomes irrelevant.

What is the price we are going to pay for that? The price we are going to pay is, as the pressure begins to rise to spend money and to cut taxes, we are going to do it without regard to protecting the surplus which we should be using to pay off this massive Federal debt and prepare Social Security for the future. We have an opportunity to protect that surplus. We are going to blow it, and that is why we need to defeat the budget resolution.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, could I inquire of the Chair, please, the remaining time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. NEUMANN) has 15½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security of the Committee on Appropriations.

(Mr. YOUNG of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, for those of us who recognize the constitutional responsibility of the Congress, to protect ourselves against things like India's nuclear capability, Pakistan's nuclear capability, China's ability, not only with nuclear but the ability to deliver a nuclear weapon or weapon of mass destruction, we say to them today, and they will be hearing from most of us who have that specific responsibility, the Neumann substitute is the only proposal before us today that even helps us keep our head level with the water. It does not get us out of the water where we ought to be.

Just yesterday my subcommittee completed the markup on the defense appropriations committee. As we went through that markup, I was convinced more and more of this one thought, that when we talk about national defense, if we have enough national defense, if we have what we need and do not have to use it, that is good. That is deterrence. But if we do not have enough, that is bad. That is disaster.

I can tell my colleagues that the President's budget does not provide enough, and the only measure before us today is the Neumann substitute because it does give us enough to at least try to keep level with inflation.

We cannot do more with less. I do not care how good we are, we cannot do more with less. We have had more deployments in the last 5 years, other than war, than any other President. It has cost us a lot of money. We are wearing out our troops. We are wearing out our equipment. We are cutting down the size of the force but extending their deployments more and more. We just cannot continue to do more with less.

The Neumann substitute gives us the opportunity to have more, to do more things that we need to do. In 2 minutes it is difficult to talk about this entire problem. Today, the size of our active duty force has been cut by 36 percent in the last 10 years. Army overseas deployments are up 300 percent from the rates that we sustained during the Cold War.

For the Navy today, on any given day 57 percent of our ships are at sea on deployment. In 1992 the figure was only 37 percent. The list goes on and on.

If we have enough, that is good. If we do not have enough, that is disaster.

Mr. Chairman, this member of Congress takes a back seat to no one when it comes to casting the tough votes to balance our federal budget and reduce the size of our federal government. However, this member of Congress also knows that each and every member of this House takes an oath of office to uphold the Constitution of the United States.

One of the principle responsibilities given Congress under our Constitution is to provide for our common defense, to raise and support armies and to maintain a navy. Today I am here to tell you that we are on the verge of abrogating this Constitutional responsibility because we are on the verge of returning to a hollow military.

As the Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on National Security, I visit on a regular basis with officers and enlisted personnel from all branches of the service. From four star flag officers to new recruits, there is widespread concern that we are overextending our troops and wearing out our equipment to the point that our readiness could soon be compromised.

For 13 years in a row, our national security budget has declined in terms of the what we can buy for each dollar we spend. During that time, real spending on our national security has declined by 40 percent.

The budget President Clinton has sent Congress for our national security in Fiscal Year 1999, which is reflected in the budget resolution reported to this House by the Budget Committee, provides for the lowest level of spending in constant dollars in more than 40 years. And over the next five years, the President's budget reduces spending on our national security by $54 billion.

Already there are 700,000 fewer troops in the field, in the air, and at sea than there were 10 years ago. This is a 36 percent cut in our active duty forces.

Not only are the number of uniformed personnel falling, but so is their morale. Every service chief tells us that they are finding it difficult to retain the best and brightest of our officers and enlisted men and women. The reasons are many. Military pay is not keeping pace with pay in the private sector and as a result I am ashamed to say that we have members of our all volunteer force who need food stamps to try and make ends meet for their families. Base housing is aging to the point where some is virtually uninhabitable.

And we are asking our troops, during a time of peace, to deploy more often and for longer periods of time than at any other peaceful period in our nation's history. Since taking office in 1992, President Clinton has sent our troops on more overseas deployments than any other president. Many of these deployment are for reasons of questionable national importance.

Army overseas deployments are up 300 percent from those rates sustained during the Cold War. This year, on any given day one of every three Army soldiers is deployed abroad.

For the Navy today, on any given day 57 percent of its ships are at sea. This is 25 percent higher than 1992.

For the Air Force, the number of Air Force personnel deployed away from home today is four times higher than in 1989—yet the Air Force is ⅓ smaller.

For too many years now, we have been asking our men and women in uniform to do more with less. Well guess what—the Secretary of Defense estimates the President's five year budget proposal, which further shrinks our nation's defense, will require a reduction in end strength of 54,000 active duty personnel and 49,000 reservists. So while this President continues to deploy our troops on more missions around the world, he continues to shrink the size of our forces, and jeopardizes our overall readiness.

Is it any wonder that pilot retention in the Air Force is down significantly. Just a few years ago, the re-enlistment rate for pilots was 75 percent. Today it is 36 percent, well below the Air Force's target of 58 percent.

Both the Navy and Air Force tell me that they are well below their reenlistment targets for first term sailors and airmen. The Air Force is 18 percent below its re-enlistment goal and the Navy 7 percent. The Navy Times newspaper recently reported that 75 percent of the sailors surveyed plan on leaving the service as early as possible.

Not only are we wearing out our troops and their families, but we are wearing out our equipment. Mission capable rates for our Air Force and Navy aircraft have fallen every year since 1991. There are increasing shortages of spare parts and cannibalization of existing aircraft is on the rise. Remember the hanger queens of the Carter Administration? Well they're back in the Clinton Administration and the situation will only become worse.

Last year my committee had to add $600 million to the President's budget to pay for the additional need for spare parts. Still, the Commander in Chief for the Pacific region tells me cannibalization rates have doubled in just the past two years.

Stop to consider tat our principal Air Force fighter aircraft were designed in the early 1970's. The President's budget calls for the procurement of only two fighters this year.

This would be the lowest number in the history of the Air Force.

Stop to consider that the average age of the Army's medium truck fleet is 25 years old. More than half of those trucks qualify for antique plates. Under the President's budget, this fleet will not be replaced for another 30 years.

Stop to consider that under the President's budget, the Navy proposes to build only six new ships next year. This is far below the 10 ships per year that would be required to sustain the current fleet of 326 ships.

Since Desert Storm, we have cut our active-duty Army from 18 divisions to 10, our combat tactical aircraft by 40 percent, our bomber fleet by 59 percent, and our combat ships by 35 percent.

Don't just take my word for it. Listen to our service chiefs.

The Commandant of the Marine Corps told me he is $500 million, or half a billion dollars, short of what he needs in the 1999 budget for equipment procurement alone. He said the cumulative effect of year after year of these shortages will be devastating to the Corps.

The Chief of Staff of the Army told me just a few weeks ago that under the current budget scenarios the Army could go under.

A frustrated Navy Commander told a newspaper reporter that his F–14 squadron was a hazard to operations because the unit has only averaged two mission capable aircraft instead of the usual 14.

And Secretary Cohen, who is President Clinton's top civilian adviser on national defense matters, just testified before Congress saying with regard to readiness that ''We are starting to see signs of some erosion, certainly on the edges of things.''

Mr. Speaker, this past weekend, my wife Beverly and I had the honor of participating in commissioning ceremonies for U.S.S. *Pearl Harbor* (LSD 52). More than 1,500 Pearl Harbor survivors came from all over the nation to be a part of these ceremonies.

As I told all those veterans gathered there in San Diego, as well as the first crew to bring U.S.S. *Pearl Harbor* to life, we can never repay our debt of gratitude to those who have served our nation in uniform and to those who have paid the ultimate price. We can however, dedicate ourselves to ensuring that in their honor and memory we do all within our power as members of Congress to maintain the strongest, most ready national defense.

Mr. Speaker, I close with this thought. When dealing with national defense, to have it and not need it is good. That is deterrence. But to need it and not have it is a disaster.

Every one of us in this Congress today should decide it's time to stop the decline in our commitment to a strong national defense and begin the steady progress to modernize our force, boost the morale of our troops, and prepare for whatever threat may present itself to our nation and our national interests in the coming century. That is our sworn Constitutional responsibility.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW).

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Chairman, I thank our leader who is leading this debate for us.

Mr. Chairman, two years ago I watched this kind of debate on my television set at home in Michigan. Last night, as I went home and watched the very end of the debate again on my television in my little apartment, I had deja vu all over again, as they say.

What I saw was a replay of the 104th Congress talking about the potential for dramatic cuts and threats to Medicare, education, the environment, and a focus on providing tax breaks for the wealthy and trying and essentially to blow up a balanced budget agreement that we came to in historic fashion just a year ago. It was extremely disheartening.

My constituents asked me to come here during this session to do away with that. They do not want the days of possible government shutdowns or threats to those things that affect their lives every day.

Last year we passed a historic balanced budget agreement. I rise today to support that by rejecting the Neumann substitute, the Kasich budget, and supporting the Spratt budget that allows us to continue the balanced budget that we agreed to in a bipartisan way, truly protect Social Security, and stand up for those things that affect our families every day.

We need to focus on those priorities that people care about in the context of balancing the budget. I can assure my colleagues that the only way we truly effect Social Security protection and preserve it is through the Spratt budget.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment and a ''yes'' vote on the Spratt amendment.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Procurement.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, let me add my strong support to that of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE), and on behalf, I think, of the men and women who wear the uniform of the United States in all the services, for the Neumann budget.

We asked the service leaders to tell us what they needed, what they were short this last year. They were pretty gutsy. Even though their commander in chief, I am sure, was not happy, they came forward and said, ''This is the list of things that we need,'' and they gave us a list of things like ammunition, spare parts, components for systems that cannot fly now. All of those things added up to $58 billion.

The Neumann substitute stops the slight in national defense. It does not give us a lot of things, no new systems, but at least allows us to have enough ammunition so we can carry out the two-war scenario.

If we really care about the mothers and fathers of this country, the best service we can give to them is to make sure that their youngsters come home alive in the time of a conflict. The Neumann substitute is the only vehicle we have here that keeps, as the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) said, the head of our military above the water. Please vote for the Nuemann substitute.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes and 40 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, these are some mighty strange cats. They offer the opportunity to fatten up the fat cats, and they offer a little cat chow for everybody else. They call it conservative, but when it comes to conserving our resources and seeing that every penny of the budget surplus that was achieved this year in historic terms is allocated to reducing the debt and protecting Social Security, they say no way.

They do not give our public schools very much to meow about either, because they really do not believe in any Federal commitment to public education. What a change it was to go from this Congress home to Texas and to see the enthusiasm for learning of young people, the determination of our professional educators, and the involvement of parents to see their young people graduate this spring. How incredibly contradictory at the very time we are celebrating learning and the struggle of American families that these Republicans in one budget called one thing and one called another do the same thing, and that is, to rip the heart out of American public education.

I had a blue ribbon school winner, the kind of principal who is there turning a gang-infested area around into a success story for young people. I asked her about this Kasich budget to rip out Title I and in her words, she said ''We would die without those Federal funds.'' That is what is at stake here, not just some rhetoric about who can be more conservative than someone else.

In my community we are turning the corner on crime. It has not hurt a bit to have 200 new officers on our streets to help deal with the problem of juvenile violence. These folks say forget that, we want to cut what is there now, not help to do more about juvenile violence.

They say they can do it with just a penny across the board. Well, they could not find one penny, one $400 hammer out of the Defense Department bureaucracy to cut. Not a penny do they cut there. They say they have got to have more money in order to succeed.

Mr. Chairman, they say there is more than one way to skin a cat, but I maintain that, under either of these Republican budgets, it is only the American people that are going to get skinned.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a point that when the cats are making their case, they are never going to dog it.

Then I would like to correct a couple of the minor misstatements. The budget that we are currently considering that I have presented here puts more money aside for Social Security than any other budget that has been considered in Washington, D.C. this year. It is offensive for anyone to get on this floor and somehow say this budget is not the best budget for Social Security, because anybody who looks at the numbers will realize that there is more money for Social Security in this budget than anything else under consideration here.

Education. Education has got inflationary increases in spending. We do not increase the role of Federal Government; we leave that to the parents, families and communities.

Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege to yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, let me first of all say I am disheartened by what I just heard. The misstatement of fact is inappropriate for this body.

Should the size of this government grow? That is the question we need to ask. Should this government get bigger? There is only one budget that says no, we will grow it right with inflation and not let it get bigger, and that is this budget.

Is there any budget that truly puts teeth in protecting Social Security? There is only one. It is Nuemann. We put it in negotiable bonds. It is not paper anymore. It is truly bonds.

Do we really save Social Security? You bet. Is the money that goes into the trust fund really put into something that matters, not just more paperwork that we can flip around with the transportation bill and use?

We heard the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) talk about education. This budget, the Neumann budget, sends the money to the classrooms. It sends 95 percent of the education dollars to the local classrooms and lets them do it: the teachers, the principals, the local school board. So that is another reason that it is better than any proposal.

Number five, it cuts taxes. You bet. It eliminates the marriage penalty. It expands the 15 percent tax bracket, which happens to be where most people are in this country. It eliminates the death tax on the farmers and the ranchers and those that can least afford to pay it.

Finally, yes, it reduces the holding period on capital gains, because for once we now can prove that lowering that actually generates more revenue for the country.

Finally, it dedicates 50 percent of everything that comes in above excess revenues for reduction in the debt.

It is unfortunate that we hear rhetoric that does not match the facts. It is unfortunate that this body is abused in that manner. I am sorry that we have to hear that. But if the American public does not want this government to grow any larger, then they should, in fact, insist on the Neumann budget. It does what the American people ask.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, this is a bad budget. It is a bad amendment to a bad budget. We Democrats are grateful that our Republican colleagues would bring up something like this, because it makes clear the differences between the parties: cuts in education, cuts for senior citizens, cuts in health, cuts for the environment, cuts for the protection of natural resources, cuts for things that are important to the little people of this country. That is what is in the budget that comes from over here, and that is what is in the substitute.

It is only 51 days that we are late bringing this up. I can understand my Republican colleagues were probably ashamed to put this kind of travesty before this body. It is, however, something which makes very clear the difference between the two parties. It shows where our Republican friends are coming from.

They are not interested in maintaining the agreement which we had last time on the budget, which has helped give us perhaps the greatest level of prosperity which we have had. They are not interested in preserving programs which are helpful and of value to the little people of this country. They want to cut the things which are investments in the future of this country, like education, protection of our natural resources, and things of this kind.

We have not worked very hard this session. I think, perhaps, given the way this budget reflects the behavior of my Republican colleagues, that is probably a very good thing.

There are a lot of things that we could be doing which would be helping the people. We could deal with the managed care problem. We could address the problem in Superfund. But, no, we are out here today cutting programs which are important to the people.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER).

□ 1200

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, one fact is very clear today. Two out of three are not bad. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) offers a budget alternative that increases spending and increases taxes. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. NEUMANN) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) offer budgets which spend less and tax less. Clearly the budget of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. NEUMANN) is the budget which is best for Social Security.

Mr. Chairman, let us remember what the number one goal of this year should be. That is to eliminate the marriage tax penalty, because the most fundamental question we should be answering is, is it right, is it fair, that 21 million married working couples pay on the average $1,400 more just because they are married? That is wrong. The Neumann budget and the Kasich budget make their centerpiece the elimination of the marriage tax penalty.

We have two opportunities out of three votes today to eliminate the marriage tax penalty. Let us vote aye on Neumann, let us vote aye on Kasich. Mr. Chairman, they both deserve bipartisan support.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I am not here to speak about the CATS' meow. Mr. Chairman, here we go again. To placate the extremists, the Republican leadership has brought to the floor a budget which is so extreme that the Republican Senate Committee on the Budget chairman has called it a mockery. Republican Governors say that this Republican budget violates the agreements that were made with the States. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in the Senate says that Congress cannot function with this Republican budget.

Mr. Chairman, budgets are not just about numbers, budgets are about values. Budgets are about priorities, and they are about who we are as a Nation.

Let us take a look at the Republican values, as illustrated in the Kasich budget, the Republican budget. The budget fails to preserve Social Security. It would cut health services to seniors, to pregnant women and children who cannot afford health insurance. It would cut an additional $10 billion out of veterans' health care services, and it shortchanges our future by killing investments in child care and in education. I ask the Members, are these the kinds of values that we are about in the United States of America?

This budget eliminates the investment in improving the quality of early childhood education, to help children start school ready to learn. It eliminates child care assistance to the working poor, so they can leave welfare, go to work, and be able to know that their kids are safe. I ask Americans, does this budget reflect their values?

It eliminates Title I funds to help our most disadvantaged children catch up to their peers in school. Does this really reflect our values? It eliminates funds to help teachers update their curriculum, to teach our youngsters to the highest standards. It eliminates funds to modernize schools, and to put computers in every classroom. I ask the Members, does this budget reflect American values?

The budget eliminates funds to increase the number of qualified teachers in the early grades. Mr. Chairman, this does not reflect our values.

The Republican budget walks away from the needs of children, it walks away from the needs of American families, it walks away from American values. We ought to oppose it. The papers in the last few days have characterized this as budget baloney, budget theatrics, budget mockery. Let us defeat the Kasich budget. It is wrong for the values of the United States of America.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege to yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. JOHN HOSTETTLER).

(Mr. HOSTETTLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Neumann CATs budget, in that it maintains a commitment to our national defense. The United States Constitution declares, ''We, the people of the United States, in order to provide for the common defense, do ordain and establish this Constitution.''

The Neumann CATs budget merely maintains defense spending at the rate of inflation. It does not even increase defense spending, when we put into account inflation. This budget does what liberal Democrat Congresses have not done in the past. It merely maintains inflation.

If Members agree with the leader of that party who, in his formative years, in a December 3, 1969 letter to a Colonel Holmes said that he ''loathes the military,'' Members will vote against the Neumann CATs budget. If Members believe that we should maintain our commitment to the military, if they love the men and women in uniform and they believe that we should maintain the rate of inflation and they do not loathe the United States military, I suggest Members vote for the Neumann budget and support our men and women in uniform.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HEFNER).

(Mr. HEFNER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to nobody on my support for the military. On military construction, we have had hundreds of calls for add-ons to the military construction budget, but our allocation is so low we are not able to do it. There were calls from Republicans and Democrats.

We rewrite history around here pretty regularly. I remember when Ronald Reagan was President, a group of us went up to Camp David and we were talking about budgets. I said, Mr. President, what is going to happen to us if the economy does not operate like you think and we get down to the point where we have these tremendous deficits? God bless his heart, he said, we will just have to face that when we get to it. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. CHARLIE STENHOLM) was there.

Our distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget, my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHN KASICH) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NEWT GINGRICH), the Speaker, this morning, talked about, and the gentleman with the belt last night, talking about we can only cut one penny, one penny.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFNER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, that gentleman referred to was the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT), my good friend.

Mr. HEFNER. He wears that big a belt?

Mr. NEUMANN. Nine feet.

Mr. HEFNER. He said we can cut one penny, but they do not cut 1 percent. We have two-thirds of the budget that is untouchable. Members know that. We have been around here a long while.

The Speaker asked this morning if Members cannot find 1 percent, but that is not 1 percent they are going to find. In 1993, and one of the gentlemen last night, and I will not call names, he got up and said that was a disaster, that the only thing that got this economy moving again was when we elected the new Republicans. That is not true. In 1993, without one single Republican vote in the House or the Senate, we passed a package that got this economy moving, with interest rates down, low unemployment. Members can talk whatever they like about it, but something made it happen. That is the only thing we did, and that is what made it happen to make this possible for us to even have a surplus to talk about.

But at that time, let me just quote what some of the folks in the Republican Party said about that package that we passed. In fact, when it passed, a woman that voted for it, they stood on that side and said, ''Bye-bye, bye-bye, you are going to lose because of that.'' So they go out and spread the stuff that we had raised taxes on low-income people, which we did not.

Mr. Chairman, we raised taxes on 2 percent of the wealthiest people in this country, and Ronald Reagan said 50 percent of Social Security, that was to be taxed. We raised that, but we also raised the threshold of what people could make before there was a tax, so there was no tax on working people.

Here is what some of the Republicans said when we passed that package. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NEWT GINGRICH) said, ''The tax increase will kill jobs and lead to a recession, and the recession will force people off of work and onto unemployment,'' and the deficit will actually increase.

Our distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget said, ''We're going to find out whether we have higher deficits, we're going to find out whether we have a slower economy, we're going to find out what's going to happen to interest rates, and it's our bet that this is a job killer.'' And the unemployment rate is lower than it has been in decades.

Here is something else our chairman said. ''It's like a snake bite. The venom is going to be injected into the body of this economy, in our judgment, and it's going to spread throughout the body and it's going to begin to kill the jobs that Americans now have.''

I maintain that the Republican budget will do exactly that.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege to yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

(Mr. SHADEGG asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Neumann budget, because it sets the right priorities.

But before I begin my remarks, let me just comment on the mystifying debate on this floor which continues to use the word cut, cut, cut, cut. There is not a single cut in this budget. This budget grows spending. It grows it from $1,705 billion in the first year to $1,894 billion in the last year. Over the last 5 years we have grown spending by $7.8 trillion. In the next we are going to grow it by $8.9 trillion. There is no cut.

This debate raises the fundamental question, should government grow at 2 to 3 times the rate of the growth in salaries of the American people? Because make no mistake about it, that is what that side wants. Government has an insatiable appetite for more money and more spending, and that is what they want.

What does that mean to the American people? For the last 8 years, the average American has seen his or her salary go up 3.4 percent, a 3.4 percent increase in their compensation. But government, government has grown at almost double that rate. Domestic discretionary spending in 1991 went up by 6.9 percent, in 1992 by 9.6 percent, in 1993 by 6.64 percent, in 1994 by 6.1 percent, in 1995 by 4.6 percent.

Over the period, while Americans have seen their wages go up only 3.4 percent, government has grown at double that rate, 5.2 percent in domestic discretionary spending. But what has happened in mandatory spending? Means-tested entitlements have grown at three times the rate of the growth in the income of the average American family. Total mandatory spending is growing at double the rate, 5.3 percent versus 3.4 percent.

This budget sets the right priorities for Americans. While defense spending is declining, it makes up that. Defense spending has gone down during this time period by 11.6 percent. We must set the right priorities and protect defense spending, and reduce the rate of growth in discretionary spending.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, as we continue to talk about the budget, and I have listened intently, it seems to me that we have some strange priorities in this country. I hear us talking about how well the economy is doing. We are continuing to grow and expand, and then at the same time, I hear us talk about taking away entitlement opportunities for the needy, taking away programs for those who are not a part of the expanding economy; talking about retrenching public housing.

Under this budget, there is a possibility that 1 million low-income families could lose public housing vouchers and certificates over the next 5 years. If this is the budget of priority for the American people, then I certainly hope it can be realigned, changed, and re-altered. Let us come with a budget that helps all of the people of America, as opposed to only those who are most affluent and at the top.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that budgets are not only instruments and tools of management; but they are also indicators of direction and priorities. If this is indeed the case, then I have some grave concerns and reservations about the budget resolution which has been put before us by the majority in this House.

At a time when we are experiencing vast economic expansion and growth, the majority resolution seeks to place deep cuts in programs designed to assist the needy and working class in this country. The resolution cuts Medicare by $10.1 billion, and Medicaid—the program that provides health care for the poor by $12 billion over five years. In addition, the Republican resolution cuts funding for education and child care, and eliminates direct federal funding to school districts by repealing Title I grants and other non-defense discretionary programs by $45 billion over a five year period.

The Republican budget turns its back on seniors, children and Social Security, and focuses on cuts, and more cuts to those who need help the most. While at the same time it rewards the rich and more affluent with private retirement accounts at the expense of Social Security, and provides $101 billion in new tax cuts. Under this proposal, 1 million households could lose federal housing vouchers and certificates by year 2003.

The Democratic alternative on the other hand preserves Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and Education. It invests in the future of our children. The Democratic alternative is good for working families, senior citizens, children, and for the average person. It strengthens America. I urge that we oppose the Republican budget resolution and support the democratic alternative. It is better for all America.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege to yield 30 seconds to my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, very briefly, each one of these bars represents how much money has been spent by the Federal Government for each one of these years, 1994 through 2003.

In 1994 we started out at $1.4 trillion. We are ending up in the committee's budget at $1.9 trillion. What happens? I am going to draw a line here. The budget of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. MARK NEUMANN) suggests that we stay with inflation, and we actually reduce very slightly the spending over the next 5 years. The Democrat or the Spratt budget actually suggests that we increase spending. It is important to know that we have to live within inflation.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FORD).

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, Senator DOMENICI has called it a mockery, and Senator STEVENS has asked us where will we get the $45 billion in discretionary cuts. My Republican colleagues, many in the Committee on the Budget, have all said these cuts are not desirable or attainable.

I say to my friends in Memphis, in Cummings and Winchester and Goodland, and at Idlewilde Elementary who are graduating today, I apologize for not being there, but I assure the Members my Republican colleagues who raised this budget resolution issue last night, at 11:30 last night, is the reason I am not home.

With schools crumbling around our Nation, our Republican colleagues and, I might add, even some of my Democratic colleagues are to blame as well, but we have to point the finger where the finger ought to be pointed. Republican friends of mine in the Congress, despite the fact that a Democratic President balanced the budget, lowered interest rates, lowered inflation, and lowered unemployment, instead of working together to save Social Security, to preserve those initiatives, which many of my colleagues, I look at the gentleman from California (Mr. DUKE CUNNINGHAM), who serves so ably, he will move on from this Congress one day and benefit from Medicaid and Social Security. Let us preserve that first.

□ 1215

I say to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) who said that we spend too much here in Washington on education, 95 percent of the funding and policy decisions in education in America are made at the local level. Let us do more at the Federal level to rebuild our schools, hire teachers, develop after-school programs, and prepare the next generation of Americans.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS).

(Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support a budget that will provide America's families with $150 billion in tax cuts and also take a big whack out of our national debt. I also rise today to support a budget that will make national defense once again a national priority by taking less of families' hard-earned income and paychecks, taking a bite out of our national debt and strengthening our national defense.

The Neumann budget will strengthen our families, our economy, and our Nation. I appeal to my colleagues to support this legislation because America's families deserve nothing less.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support a budget that will provide America's families with $150 billion in tax cuts and also take a big whack out of the national debt. I also rise today to support a budget that will make national defense, once again, a national priority. That legislation is the substitute budget offered by my friend from Wisconsin, Rep. MARK NEUMANN, and I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. Chairman, last year, the average income for a family in which both parents worked was $55,000 a year. Of that money, roughly half of that family's income went to pay federal, state and local taxes. My friends, how can we expect a family to take care of themselves and their children when the government takes half of what they earn? It just doesn't make any sense.

That's why I support the Neumann substitute budget, because it would provide America's families with $150 billion in tax relief, so families can keep more of their hard-earned paychecks. The Neumann budget would also eliminate the so-called marriage penalty, which is basically a tax increase couples must pay once they become married.

But that's not all. The Neumann budget realizes that we can't give our kids a $5.5 trillion national debt and expect them to have a better future. So it calls for 50 percent of any remaining budget surplus to go towards reducing the national debt, so we can give our kids a clean financial slate for the future.

The Neumann budget also seeks to increase defense spending by an additional $56 billion over last year's budget. With threats to our national security in Iraq and all across the world, we cannot afford to be lax in the maintenance of our military. The Neumann budget gives our troops the resources they need to be successful in any mission they might undertake.

By taking less of families' hard-earned paychecks, taking a bite out of the national debt and strengthening our national defense, the Neumann budget will strengthen our families, our economy and our nation. I appeal to my colleagues to support this legislation, because the families of America deserve nothing less.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the ranking member, very much for yielding me this time, and I rise to vigorously oppose this budget which destroys our commitment to the families of America and the children of America.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

(Mr. NEUMANN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to set this discussion in proper perspective today. Recently one of the polling companies from here in Washington, D.C., asked 2,000 American adults, ''Do you think the United States Government should increase faster that the rate of inflation, faster than the family budget; at the same rate as the family budget; or slower than the family budget?'' It was a 90-to-3 answer. Ninety percent of Americans believe that the United States Government should not increase faster than the family budget or faster than the rate of inflation.

So we decided we were going to put together a proposal that met the wishes and the demands of the American people. This black line on this chart that I have here shows inflation. That is how fast the family budgets are going up across America.

The farthest column, that shows how fast the CAT's budget is increasing spending out here in the government. And I would point out that it is the only proposal that we are considering, the President's, the Senate, the House, the Democrat alternative, it is the only proposal that we are considering out here today that allows government spending to go up at a slower rate than the rate of inflation.

Mr. Chairman, 90 percent of the American people believe that the Federal Government should not increase its spending faster than the family budget, and this is the only opportunity we have today to keep that and to meet that wish.

The House budget, the Kasich budget, if we take Social Security out of the picture, it also meets that. With Social Security in the picture, it goes up slightly faster than the rate of inflation but it is the second closest to meeting the wishes of the American people.

I have heard a lot of rhetoric about preserving Social Security. Baloney. The only budget out here that puts more money aside for Social Security is the budget we are about to vote on. The CAT's budget puts $275 billion aside to preserve and protect Social Security.

I believe every senior citizen in the United States of America has a right to get up tomorrow morning knowing that their Social Security is safe and secure. So in the CAT's budget we put more money aside for Social Security than any other budget being considered.

So let us cut through the rhetoric out here and let us get down to the facts of what is actually being considered. The CAT's budget puts aside $275 billion for Social Security; the House budget, $223 billion; the Senate proposal, $149 billion; and the President's proposal just under $100 billion.

So if Members are serious about preserving Social Security for our senior citizens in this country, the CAT's budget is the right vote.

What about the tax burden on American workers? The tax burden is too high. A generation ago 25 cents out of every dollar that workers earned went to taxes. Today that number is 37 cents out of every dollar they earned. Let us translate that into what it means. It means that American workers have to take second and third jobs in order to pay that extra tax burden from this government. That is wrong.

That is why the CAT's budget proposes $150 billion in additional tax reductions. Eliminate the marriage tax penalty. Across-the-board tax cuts. And, shoot, the inheritance tax, we have already paid taxes on it once. I believe every American in this country after working hard should have the opportunity to pass their inheritance on to their children, not to the United States Government. That is why we have proposed extensive tax relief.

How are we able to set aside for money for Social Security and provide additional tax relief? That really goes back to the first chart, and again this first chart shows it emphatically. This is the only budget that holds spending increases in this government at or below the rate of inflation. These others that are going up faster than the rate of inflation will say good-bye to the tax cuts, will say good-bye to that money is that supposed to be set aside for Social Security, because every nickel over the rate of inflation, that is money that should be set aside to preserve and protect Social Security and reduce the tax burden on our American families.

Let me close with what I believe the priorities of this Nation are, because we have been hearing about these priorities and where we place our priorities in this country. I believe our priorities should be to defend our Nation. I believe it is the number one role of this government, to make sure that this Nation is safe and secure for our children.

I think our responsibility is to return the control of education back to the parents and the teachers and the community. Control of education should not be out here at the United States Government. And just for the record, this budget allows inflationary increases in education.

Preserve Social Security and reduce the tax burden. Those are the priorities of the CAT's budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, the Neumann substitute is an amendment and its main failing is that it fails to amend, correct, fix the many defects that are in the Kasich budget. In fact, it worsens them.

At the outset I read a long bill of particulars to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. NEUMANN) if any of these problems in the Kasich budget had been cured or corrected in his substitute, and I have yet to hear an answer.

He wants to go 50 percent further with spending reduction beyond Mr. KASICH. In income security, where the Kasich resolution would take $10 billion out of TANF, we already have a letter from the gentleman's governor, the governor of Wisconsin, a stinging rebuke saying this is a repudiation of the governors' agreement with respect to welfare reform. Presumably the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. NEUMANN) would go further, $15 billion out of the TANF block grant.

Law enforcement, Kasich cuts law enforcement by $8 billion. If the gentleman from Wisconsin wants to go 50 percent further, presumably he will take $12 billion out of law enforcement.

Section 8 housing, which has just been raised by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), the Kasich budget claims to provide the outlays to renew 1 million section 8 contracts. Presumably the gentleman from Wisconsin would put 1.5 billion people out of housing. Kasich is bad enough. Neumann is worse. It is ultrabad. Vote it down.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. NEUMANN).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 158, noes 262, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 208]

AYES—158

Aderholt	Cunningham	Hostettler
Archer	Deal	Hulshof
Armey	DeLay	Hunter
Bachus	Dickey	Hutchinson
Baker	Doolittle	Hyde
Barr	Dreier	Inglis
Bartlett	Duncan	Istook
Barton	Dunn	Jenkins
Bateman	Ehrlich	Johnson, Sam
Bliley	Emerson	Jones
Blunt	Ensign	Kasich
Boehner	Everett	Kingston
Bonilla	Ewing	Klug
Brady (TX)	Foley	Knollenberg
Bryant	Fowler	LaHood
Burr	Fox	Largent
Burton	Gallegly	Lewis (CA)
Callahan	Gibbons	Lewis (KY)
Calvert	Gillmor	Livingston
Camp	Goode	Lucas
Cannon	Goodlatte	Manzullo
Chabot	Goodling	McCollum
Chambliss	Goss	McCrery
Chenoweth	Graham	McInnis
Christensen	Granger	McIntosh
Coble	Hall (TX)	McKeon
Coburn	Hansen	Metcalf
Collins	Hastert	Mica
Combest	Hastings (WA)	Miller (FL)
Cook	Hayworth	Moran (KS)
Cooksey	Hefley	Myrick
Cox	Herger	Nethercutt
Crane	Hilleary	Neumann
Cubin	Hoekstra	Norwood

Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Portman
Radanovich
Redmond
Riggs
Riley
Rogan
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (MI)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowbarger
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Wicker
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—262

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bunning
Buyer
Campbell
Canady
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crapo
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gordon
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hill
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kleczka
Klink
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Ney
Northup
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snyder
Souder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Tauscher
Tauzin
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—13

Ballenger
Furse
Gejdenson
Gonzalez
Johnson, E.B.
Kennedy (MA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
McDade
Mollohan
Ros-Lehtinen
Sabo
Tanner

□ 1242

Mr. NEY changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. PACKARD, and Mr. BARR of Georgia changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part 2 of House Report 105–565.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. SPRATT

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Part 2 amendment No. 2 in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. SPRATT of South Carolina:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999.

The Congress declares that this is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1999 and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2000 through 2003 are hereby set forth.

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1999: $1,321,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,341,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,379,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,436,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,491,000,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 1999: −$900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: −$200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $700,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1999: $1,420,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,463,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,503,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,537,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,611,200,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1999: $1,403,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,445,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,484,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,501,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,578,300,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 1999: $82,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $104,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $104,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $64,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $87,300,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 1999: $5,582,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $5,756,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $5,926,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $6,059,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $6,211,100,000,000.

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and budget outlays for fiscal years 1999 through 2003 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $270,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $265,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $274,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $268,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $280,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $269,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $288,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $272,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $296,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $279,800,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $14,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $14,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $15,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $15,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $15,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,500,000,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $18,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $17,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $17,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $17,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $17,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,700,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $0.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, −$100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,000,000,000.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $23,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $23,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $22,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $22,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $22,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,700,000,000.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $12,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $11,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $10,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $10,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $10,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,300,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $4,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $14,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $14,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $15,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $14,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,500,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $51,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $52,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $53,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $54,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $56,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,900,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $8,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $7,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $7,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $7,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $7,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,100,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $63,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $64,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $65,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $66,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $69,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,700,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $145,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $143,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $151,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $151,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $159,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $159,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $166,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $167,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $177,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $178,600,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $209,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $210,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $221,510,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $220,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $239,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $242,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $251,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $248,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $273,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $273,400,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $246,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $247,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $259,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $258,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $270,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $268,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $280,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $278,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $291,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $288,900,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $12,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $13,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $12,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $14,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $15,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,300,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $43,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $44,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $45,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $47,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $49,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,800,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $25,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $24,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $24,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $24,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $25,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,600,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $14,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $13,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $13,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $13,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $13,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,400,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $296,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $296,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $297,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $297,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $296,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $296,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $296,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $296,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $297,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $297,800,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, −$2,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$1,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$2,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$3,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$3,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, −$800,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,000,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, −$37,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$37,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$39,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$39,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$43,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$43,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$51,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$51,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, −$42,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$42,700,000,000.

SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.

(a) SUBMISSIONS.—Not later than 30 days after the date of adoption of this resolution, the House committees named in subsection (b) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(b) INSTRUCTIONS TO HOUSE COMMITTEES.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending to decrease outlays by $0 for fiscal year 1999 and decrease outlays by $40,000,000 for fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(2) COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The House Committee on Banking and Financial Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending to decrease outlays by $212,000,000 for fiscal year 1999 and decrease outlays by $1,045,000,000 for fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(3) COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE.—The House Committee on Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending to decrease outlays by $707,000,000 for fiscal year 1999 and decrease outlays by $2,765,000,000 for fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(4) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The House Committee on Education and the Workforce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending to decrease outlays by $86,000,000 for fiscal year 1999 and increase outlays by $3,443,000,000 for fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(5) COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES.—The House Committee on Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that that provide direct spending to decrease outlays by $3,000,000 for fiscal year 1999 and decrease outlays by $381,000,000 for fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(6) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending to decrease outlays by $437,000,000 for fiscal year 1999 and decrease outlays by $892,000,000 for fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

SEC. 5. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF COMPENSATION AND PAY FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.

In the House, for purposes of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, establishing on a prospective basis compensation or pay for any office or position in the Government at a specified level, the appropriation for which is provided through annual discretionary appropriations, shall not be considered as providing new entitlement authority or new budget authority.

SEC. 6. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON TOTAL BUDGET SURPLUSES AND SOCIAL SECURITY.

It is the sense of Congress that:

(1) The total budget surplus should be reserved until the Congress and the President enact comprehensive measures providing for the long-term solvency of Social Security, while preserving its core protections for present and future generations of American families.

(2) There should be established within the Treasury a ''Save Social Security First Reserve Fund'' to be used to save budget surpluses until a reform measure is enacted to ensure the long-term solvency of the Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance Trust Funds. The Secretary of the Treasury should pay into the account at the end of each fiscal year an amount equal to the surplus, if any, in the total budget of the United States Government for that fiscal year. Balances in that account should be invested in Treasury securities and interest earnings should be credited to the account.

SEC. 7. RESERVE FUND FOR POTENTIAL TOBACCO LEGISLATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Budget authority and outlays may be allocated to a committee or committees for legislation that increases funding to promote smoking prevention and cessation, curbs cigarette smoking among teenagers, makes payments to the States to mitigate the costs incurred of treating smoking-related illnesses, provides support to tobacco farmers, makes payments to other claimants against tobacco companies, or funds Federal medical research, within such a committee's jurisdiction, if such a committee or the committee of conference on such legislation reports such legislation, and if, to the extent that the costs of such legislation are not included in this concurrent resolution on the budget, the enactment of such legislation will not increase (by virtue of either contemporaneous or previously passed legislation) the deficits in this resolution for—

(1) fiscal year 1999; and

(2) the period of fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(b) REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—Upon the reporting of legislation pursuant to subsection (a), and again upon the submission of a conference report on such legislation (if a conference report is submitted), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives may file with the House appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised functional levels and aggregates to carry out this subsection. Such revised allocations, functional levels, and aggregates shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations, functional levels, and aggregates contained in this concurrent resolution on the budget.

(c) FEDERAL HOSPITAL INSURANCE TRUST FUND (MEDICARE PART A TRUST FUND).—Congress intends that any tobacco proceeds not used for increased funding under subsection (a) should be deposited in the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund (established under section 1817 of the Social Security Act).

SEC. 8. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE ASSETS FOR INDEPENDENCE ACT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) 33 percent of all American households have no or negative financial assets and 60 percent of African-American households have no or negative financial assets;

(2) 46.9 percent of all children in America live in households with no financial assets, including 40 percent of Caucasian children and 75 percent of African-American children;

(3) in order to provide low-income families with more tools for empowerment in lieu of traditional income support and to assist them in becoming more involved in planning their future, new public-private relationships that encourage asset-building should be undertaken;

(4) individual development account programs are successfully demonstrating the ability to assist low-income families in building assets while partnering with community organizations and States in more than 40 public and private experiments nationwide; and

(5) Federal support for a trial demonstration program would greatly assist the creative efforts of existing individual development account experiments.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that, in carrying out its reconciliation instructions pursuant to this concurrent resolution, the Committee on Ways and Means should include the text of H.R. 2849 (the Assets for Independence Act) in its submission to the House Committee on the Budget.

SEC. 9. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON A DEMONSTRATION PROJECT ON CLINICAL CANCER TRIALS.

It is the sense of Congress that the committees of jurisdiction should consider legislation this session that would establish a 3-year demonstration project providing medicare coverage for beneficiaries' participation in clinical cancer trials.

SEC. 10. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE INTERIM PAYMENT SYSTEM FOR HOME HEALTH BENEFITS UNDER MEDICARE.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the interim payment system for home health service has adversely affected some home health care agencies and medicare beneficiaries;

(2) if home health care is threatened and further reduced, health care costs to Federal and State governments, as well as families, may rise to cover more expensive post-hospital and long-term care;

(3) the committees of jurisdiction should initiate a revision of the interim payment system, paying particular attention to providing a more gradual reduction in home health care costs and additional time for home health care agencies to adjust to lower rates and reimbursements;

(4) due to the critical nature of this issue, Congress should enact an equitable and fair revision of the interim payment system before the adjournment of the 105th Congress; and

(5) the Health Care Financing Administration should fully implement by October 1, 1999, the prospective payment system that was enacted into law last year.

SEC. 11. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON TAX RELIEF.

It is the sense of Congress that the committees of jurisdiction should accommodate high priority tax relief of approximately $30,000,000,000 over 5 years within legislation that fully offsets revenues lost by closing or restricting unwarranted tax benefits. Such tax relief should—

(1) accommodate the revenue effects of improving rights for medical patients and providers in managed care health plans;

(2) expand tax credits to alleviate the costs of child care for families;

(3) reduce financing costs for primary and secondary public school modernization;

(4) extend long-supported and previously renewed tax benefits that will soon expire such as the Work Opportunity and Research and Experimentation credits; and

(5) mitigate tax code ''marriage penalties'' in a manner at least equal in scope to the 1995 tax relief provision of H.R. 2491.

Amend the title so as to read: ''A concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 1999 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003.''.

☐ 1245

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). Pursuant to House Resolution 455, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), the minority whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, when I finally got a good look at this Republican budget, it reminded me of a country song that I once heard entitled My Daddy Took a Back-Hoe and Built Me a Sand-Castle of Sludge.

Mr. Chairman, what a mess. After a long wait, with lots of noise, lots of rumbling and too much slip-sliding around the details, my colleagues across the aisle have come up with a budget that just will not stand up. I think we would all be lucky if a big wave just came along and washed it all out to sea.

Fortunately, the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, has developed a budget plan that is both solid and sensible. I want to congratulate him on his work. The Democratic budget is a responsible budget, it shows fiscal restraint, and it harnesses this Nation's potential to help move this country forward.

The Democratic budget invests in education. It includes funding to modernize our schools, to reduce class size, to improve discipline and to help our students excel.

From Head Start to Pell grants, this budget says that the strength of our Nation tomorrow depends on the education we give our children today.

In addition to education, the Democratic budget invests in better health care. It expands Medicare, it protects Medicaid, it funds medical research and moves to establish a Patients' Bill of Rights so that doctors and patients and nurses can make medical decisions and not insurance companies.

The Democratic budget protects the environment. On this I want to pay particular compliment to my friend from South Carolina and the Democrats on the Committee on the Budget, because they provide vital resources to clean up our rivers and our lakes, to get rid of toxic waste sites and to preserve our great natural inheritance for generations to come.

The Democratic budget proposal protects Social Security. It sets aside the budget surplus until we can reach a bipartisan plan to fund it for the long term. Our parents, Mr. Chairman, should not have to worry about their retirement and neither should their children.

The Democratic budget also offers working families $30 billion in tax relief. It cuts the marriage penalty, it expands the child care tax credit, it helps small businesses, and it makes health care more affordable.

All in all, it is a good budget. It is a balanced budget. It is a budget that invests in people and creates opportunity. It stands, I sadly say here this afternoon, in stark contrast to the Republican budget.

The budget was due on the 15th of April. We have waited, patiently, and we have waited. This budget that they submitted is the latest budget in the history of the United States Congress. What did they finally come up with? They came up with the same old bilge that Americans have rejected time and time again.

The Republican budget begins to dismantle Social Security, it slashes Medicaid, it cheats education, it bulldozes the environment, it squanders the surplus. Even Senator DOMENICI, excuse me for mentioning the other body, Mr. Chairman, distinguished gentleman from New Mexico, a Republican, he called the Republican House budget, and I quote, a mockery.

This budget that they have proposed moves us backward. That is the wrong direction. We cannot afford to backslide. We need better schools. We need a cleaner environment and more affordable health care, not the same old slash-and-burn tactics of the Contract on America.

The Democratic budget plan builds on our current successes, it keeps the budget in balance, it helps working families, and it invests in the future of this great country.

I urge my colleagues to support the Spratt budget and oppose the Republican budget.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON), my colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means.

(Mr. HOUGHTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I will make this very brief. I am going to have to vote against the Spratt substitute budget since it suggests a variety of policy changes that I do not think are appropriate. But I will support the Kasich budget. I feel we need to keep the process moving.

Having said that, in all honesty, I do this with a great reluctance. Let me tell my colleagues why in three reasons.

First of all, the premise of long-term tax cuts partially paid for by short-term expense reductions violates the pay-go principles that we so hard fought for several years ago. This is like taking out a 30-day note to pay for your dream house which you hope to live in for the rest of your life. It does not make any sense at all.

Secondly, I worry about putting expense numbers on a piece of paper which are important, impact the future but which are totally unrealistic. This does not represent profiles in courage.

Thirdly, I have lived long enough that a tree does not grow to heaven. We are enjoying a strong economy, maybe even a bubble economy. I do not think we should do anything to do something untoward at this particular time, so we really understand what we are going through now.

So one can ask, why do I feel and why am I going to vote for this budget at all? I feel it is important for the body to send a document, imperfect as it may be, to conference with the Senate. I stand behind the process. I want to keep it moving. However, as a parting shot, if the numbers come back to us after the conference as they are set out before us now, I am going to vote the other way.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

(Mrs. LOWEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Spratt substitute.

Let's be honest: the Republican budget resolution is a political document that fails even the most basic test of mathematics and fiscal reality. Its authors know it, I know it, we all know it. Even their party's most respected budget expert in the Senate, Senator DOMENICI, called this GOP budget "a mockery."

The National Conference on State Legislators, the National League of Cities, and many Governors—of both parties—have also expressed their opposition to the resolution.

Instead of keeping faith with last year's Balanced Budget Agreement, the Republican leadership's budget requires cuts in domestic programs that are so draconian that its authors don't even have the courage to tell the American people what they are. What we do know is that $100 billion dollars—in addition to the reductions adopted last year—would have to be cut from Medicare, Medicaid, education, environment, veterans and other domestic programs over the next five years.

As has been the case time and time again, these budget cuts will hurt low- and moderate-income working—and tax-paying—families the hardest. If this budget is adopted, it also will force us to turn a blind eye to serious national problems such as crumbling and overcrowded schools.

Because of the restrictive rule governing this debate, the only responsible budget plan before us is this substitute offered by the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. SPRATT. This resolution keeps faith with last year's bipartisan budget agreement, includes $30 billion in carefully targeted tax cuts, and will provide funding to fix school buildings, provide affordable child care, hire 75,000 new teachers, and boost investments in medical research. It also protects Americans' retirement income by reserving all budget surpluses for Social Security until a long-term plan for preserving Social Security is adopted.

For the sake of our children, our veterans, and the future of our Nation, I urge support of the Spratt substitute and opposition to the underlying bill.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. KENNELLY).

Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Spratt substitute because I think the gentleman from South Carolina, with his years of experience in the budget process, has put together a substitute that makes sense and does not repeat failures of the past, such as in 1981 when we made promises to cut taxes, to increase defense spending, and to cut discretionary spending to pay for those things, which of course, never happened.

When I look at the budget resolution that is before us today, I see that same thing happening. I see it in a particular area of great interest to me, and an area that I have put a great deal of time into, and that area is the marriage penalty, something that affects millions of families. I do think our budget should move in that direction, to help the working families of America.

I have worked for years to fix the marriage penalty. In fact, I called for the CBO report which is now the definitive study and which we can look to to help us get where we want to go. I am the leading Democrat on a bill to reinstate the two-earner deduction which is I think the best way we should go, and it has the bipartisan support of 182 cosponsors.

But when I look at the budget resolution before us today, I see a suggestion that we address the marriage penalty with a $100 billion solution. That is the top of the mark. We may like that solution, we would like to address the marriage penalty, but to pay for it by cutting other programs, I wonder if that will ever happen. I think some of us have seen some polling, and perhaps this is an issue that has become very popular. I say that because back in 1995, the majority had an opportunity to fix the marriage penalty, tried to fix it in a very small way and in a very intricate way that was very, very difficult to administer.

I stand here today saying to the chairman of the Committee on the Budget that his efforts have always been good in the past, but that right now I see him not doing what he should do to help American families. He says he is going to fix the marriage penalty. I do not know from where he is going to get the $100 billion. I hope this question, of the marriage penalty, goes to the Committee on Ways and Means and that the Committee gets back to resolving it in the way we should, in a fair way that does not penalize others while getting rid of the penalty for some. Fixing the marriage penalty is a good idea, but we should do it with some common sense.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO).

(Mr. COSTELLO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Spratt substitute.

Mr. Chairman, every year since I began serving in this body, I have sponsored a Constitutional amendment to balance the federal budget. This year's balanced budget reflects that hard work which allowed us to achieve that goal. I am proud of the way Members of Congress and the Administration worked together last year to responsibly improve the efficiency of government programs and cut taxes. It is these values that should govern our future budgets.

Unfortunately, the budget document before us today does not adhere to these principles. This resolution includes $101 billion in unspecified cuts. It repudiates last year's bipartisan agreement, and conjures memories of 1995, when the same House leadership shut the government down twice with an equally illogical budget proposal. This budget threatens the solvency of Social Security, and makes deep cuts to non-discretionary domestic spending. The American people deserve better than this, Mr. Speaker. This budget is not a blueprint to govern.

This budget does not adequately protect the surplus. Earlier this year, the President stated that the surplus should be used to guarantee the future of Social Security. There is no doubt that the Social Security Trust Fund has long-range financing problems. Insolvency of the Disability Insurance portion of Social Security is projected to occur in 2015, with the retirement survivors account reaching insolvency in 2031. That is why the budget surplus should be reserved until a bipartisan Social Security Commission, the President and Congress can address the long term requirements of the system. This resolution, however, already falls short of funding current programs and it depends too much on unspecified future cuts to offset proposed tax cuts. This irresponsibility will siphon off the surplus before it can be used to protect Social Security.

The resolution also cuts another $45 billion from discretionary spending over five years—well beyond the tight limits imposed by the Balanced Budget Agreement. We have heard many people today claim that this is just a 1% across the board cut, which seems very minor. The truth is far more disturbing. In this proposal, three-fifths of the budget is exempt from any cuts. That means all of these cuts will come from 40% of the total federal budget, which hardly qualifies as an ''across the board cut.'' Under this plan, non-defense discretionary programs will suffer a 19% loss in purchasing power by 2003. While this document does not contain cuts to specific programs. Republicans have made some of their cuts known in an earlier budget document. The Economic Development Administration, Legal Services Corporation, AmeriCorps, and the Airport Improvement Program are all targets for cuts under this resolution.

The Economic Development Administration has offered assistance to many disadvantaged communities in my congressional district. Working with the Southwestern Illinois Development Agency, the EDA has helped communities attract employers and create jobs in areas where unemployment is well above the national and state average, areas that have been affected by the closing of coal mines and the migration of industrial plants which employed thousands of people. This is not a program that benefits bureaucrats, it helps real people find jobs and improve their communities.

The Legal Services Corporation is another good example of a federal program that is effectively being administered at the local level. The creators of the LSC recognized that decisions about how legal services should be allocated are best made not by officials in Washington, but at a local level, by the people who understand the problems that face their communities.

Today, the LSC provides funds to operate programs in approximately 1,100 communities nationwide, providing services to more than a million clients per year, benefitting approximately five million individuals, the majority of them children living in poverty. Family law makes up one-third of all of the cases handled by LSC programs each year. In 1995, legal services programs handled over 9,300 cases involving abused and neglected women and children.

AmeriCorps is another valuable program enabling estimated 50,000 students to earn funds for college while performing community service in tasks ranging from assisting teachers to working on environmental clean-up. There are two highly successful AmeriCorps sites in my congressional district. The program in Belleville, Illinois places 34 participants in the disadvantaged Abraham Lincoln and Franklin neighborhoods to clean up damage from the flood of 1993, and offer conflict management training. The 24 participants in the AmeriCorps program in East St. Louis have developed a successful tutoring program in schools where resources are scarce.

The Airport Improvement Program is another critical federal initiative that is jeopardized by this budget. With airline passenger traffic expected to continue to grow, we need to ensure that airports across the country are equipped to handle future capacity. MidAmerica Airport in my district was recently opened to address the congestion program in the St. Louis and MetroEast community. This airport was completed in part through the Airport Improvement Program. Without the development of MidAmerica Airport, the region would face considerable capacity limits in the near future. The AIP is a critical component of safe and efficient air travel.

In addition to these severe cuts, the assumptions addressing transportation spending in this resolution are nothing short of fantasy. On May 22, the House and Senate overwhelmingly passed a six-year transportation bill including funding for highways, highway safety, and mass transit. The budget resolution before us today falls short of paying for this legislation by over $20 billion! Mr. Speaker, it is completely ludicrous that this budget does not include funding to pay for this legislation which has already passed overwhelmingly in Congress.

Congress realized this funding is vital because our infrastructure is crumbling around us. In my home state of Illinois, for example, a quarter of all the bridges are structurally deficient. Forty-three percent of roads in Illinois are in poor or mediocre condition. Driving on these roads costs Illinois motorist $1 billion a year in extra vehicle operating costs. That is $144 per driver. These statistics are shameful. As we enter the next millennium, we cannot allow our nation's infrastructure to languish in the past.

In my district in Southwestern Illinois projects funded in TEA21 are critical to meet the transportation needs of many communities. For example, the MetroLink light rail system provides a vital transportation link for commuters and travelers in the St. Louis-MetroEast area. MetroLink, whose ridership has surpassed all expectations, has had an enormous impact on the environment, transportation efficiency and economic development in my district and the entire St. Louis metropolitan region.

This budget also fails to identify ways we may improve the use of our resources. In his budget for this year, the President included funding to modernize and improve our public schools. I strongly believe this program should be included in the House budget resolution. It provides incentives to communities to invest in local school facilities through the use of leveraged bonds. The program targets the 100 poorest school districts in the nation, while providing money for the state's to use on poor districts within their jurisdiction.

Often we dedicate our resources to the disadvantaged schools in large urban areas, overlooking the many needy schools in rural areas. My congressional district in Southern Illinois has many schools which would benefit from this program. Many of the schools in my area are dilapidated and over 50 years old. When the school buildings are warm, safe, and comfortable, children are free to concentrate on learning. That is something that will benefit us all.

This resolution does not save the surplus, it does not adequately protect Social Security, it does not allow vital programs to continue, it does not pay for programs already passed into law, and it does not recognize ways in which government can improve its service to people. I cannot support a resolution that violates the Balanced Budget Agreement and threatens the solvency of Social Security. That is why I will support the Spratt Amendment to save Social Security and honor the Balanced Budget Agreement, and why I cannot support the Kasich budget plan.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

(Mr. STENHOLM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Spratt amendment. I would much preferred to have been supporting the Blue Dog budget, but as we know that was not to be.

Let me make certain that all of my colleagues understand what the Spratt budget does and does not do. The reason I can support it, it stays within the balanced budget agreement of last year. It does not spend any more money than what we agreed to last year, nor does it raise any more taxes than what we agreed to last year. No matter how many other people say it differently, they should know that is not true.

In addition, the Spratt budget is honest with the BESTEA, ISTEA, the TEA 21 bill by fully funding the additional amounts needed for highways and transit. If we look carefully at what the gentleman from South Carolina has done, we will see that in all aspects he is totally honest in the manner in which he pays for those additional spending proposals that he calls for, within the confines of the balanced budget agreement.

I think that that is so important for us today, because I have listened to the previous debate regarding the so-called CATs bill, and I am reminded of Yogi Berra. That was deja vu all over again. Anybody that believed that that would have worked as was proposed has got to be smoking something.

This bill that is before us in the amendment today will keep us on the track of the economy that we are now on. It lives within the agreement that we made last year. It certainly deserves our support.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for his leadership on the Committee on the Budget. On fiscal matters generally, I think in my own view, he is probably the most credible spokesperson in this House in either party on these issues. I am pleased to associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. STENHOLM. I thank the gentleman for that and I commend the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT). He has done a great job in putting forth a budget that all of us, hopefully a few on the other side of the aisle, can be supportive of.

If you agree that we set the country on the right track with the balanced budget agreement, if you agree that our economy is moving in the right direction, if you agree that we have the lowest unemployment in 25 years, if you agree that we have the lowest inflation, then let us stay with that game plan. Let us not change it. Let us not go for a budget like the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) puts out here today that is back end loaded, that promises spending cuts but only in 2002 and 2003.

☐ 1300

Mr. NUSSLE. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Miller), my colleague on the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the time to discuss this, the budget from the Democrats today.

Last night we debated the budget that was presented by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) of the Committee on the Budget, and one of the earlier speakers on the other side said the two budgets stand in stark contrast to each other, and I would have to agree with my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), on that issue because this is a contrast that shows a vision of whether we believe in more government or less government, whether we believe in more taxes or less taxes and whether we want to keep more power in Washington or if we want to shift power back to the States and individuals. And that is exactly what this is.

Fortunately, the Spratt budget, I have to admit, is a lot better than President Clinton's budget; so that is one good thing I can say about it, because it does not have as many new programs and as much new taxes, but it does have more taxes, and it does create many new programs, and that is the problem of creating more government here in Washington.

This is my sixth year on the Committee on the Budget, and the past 3, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), we have had tremendous success. We are now at a stage where we are going to have a surplus in our budget this fiscal year ending September 30 in the total amount of money coming in, the total amount of money going out. We are going to have a surplus for the first time since 1969, and that is because of the budget leadership provided by the Republicans since we took control of this House in 1995. We have cut taxes. We have had significant entitlement reforms such as welfare reform and Medicare reforms, and these reforms will save money in the long term because we are going to save the Medicare program from bankruptcy.

But the thing is it is better for the people in the programs, it is better for the senior citizens in this country under the Medicare program because now they are going to have choices and more options than they have had in the past.

Now what the Spratt budget does, it wants to expand the Medicare program while the Medicare commission is meeting right now and coming up with recommendations. Why not wait? Why do my colleagues want to expand more government and especially with a program that is in the process of going bankrupt?

In the past 3 budgets we have made a significant accomplishment in the area of discretionary spending, especially domestic discretionary. We have gotten rid of over 300 programs in the Federal Government, and actually in 1995 in the 104th Congress we actually had a reduction in discretionary domestic spending. That is a real accomplishment.

We need to stick with the budget presented by the Committee on the Budget, move forward and reduce the size and scope of the government, and I urge defeat of the Spratt amendment.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, our colleagues should vote for this budget, everybody on both sides of the aisle, for 3 reasons.

First, it is a honest budget. No games playing. What we see is what we get.

Secondly, it is a responsible budget. It keeps us on the road to fiscal responsibility, it maintains a budget surplus, it does not get us into the kind of partisan political gamesmanship that ultimately resulted in $300 billion deficits and a $5.4 trillion Federal debt. It keeps the momentum going towards fiscal responsibility that was reflected in the Bipartisan Balanced Budget Agreement just a few months ago.

And thirdly and perhaps most importantly, it is doable. We pass this budget, and we get into conference with the Senate, and we can agree to a budget within a matter of weeks. We will get this budget enacted, and then we will get our appropriations bills enacted.

And then we do not have to worry about the government shutting down.

We do not have to worry about this Congress being embarrassed at our lack of inaction or lack of ability to work together in a constructive way.

I want my colleagues to think about this:

The Republican chairman of the Senate Budget Committee called the budget that is the alternative, the Republican budget that is the alternative to this that we are offering, ''a mockery''. Senator STEVENS, the Republican chairman of the Appropriations Committee, called the majority's budget, a budget that would result in ''Congress not being able to function''. Why? Because it has got things in it that my colleagues cannot go home and justify to their constituents.

Mr. Chairman, I dare anybody that has Federal employees in their congressional district to go out and explain why they voted to cut the Federal employees health benefits plan down to a 50 percent required contribution on the part of employees. Go ahead and explain it, justify it.

My colleagues should not do this to themselves. Vote for the Spratt budget.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), who just spoke, said do not worry, do not worry, this is a doable budget, do not worry, this is a doable budget.

Do my colleagues know why it is a doable budget, know why the Spratt substitute is a doable budget? Because it does nothing. It basically is a status quo, do nothing budget. It does nothing to suggest that the government is already too big and spends still too much. It does nothing to the number of programs that need to be consolidated. It does nothing with regard to suggesting to families and individuals and farmers and small business people that they pay enough in taxes. It does nothing for some of the waste that has been rooted out through a number of hearings, everything from $800 outhouses in the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area to $584,000 homes built for park employees in Yosemite National Park to 26, and here is a do nothing, here is a let us keep the status quo: 26,000 people in 4 States receiving food stamps who are dead.

So, yes, let us do nothing, let us keep the status quo, let us vote for a budget that basically says we cannot do better than that. We cannot find a penny on the dollar. We cannot say to the American people that what they earn and what they make and what they save is more important than what happens out here in Washington, D.C. on a daily regular basis. That is do nothing.

Mr. Chairman, we do not have to worry because we have got the IRS. We can take their money out here. We do not have to worry, as the gentleman says from Virginia. Well, okay, I guess they do not want to worry.

I guess most of us on this side, and the reason why the Republicans put this budget together, was because we are worried. We are worried about the future for our kids, we are worried about the future for Social Security, we are worried about the future for health care, we want to make sure that the welfare reforms continue to progress in a responsible and a positive way, we want to make sure our kids get a decent education, controlled at home.

We are worried; that is why you need to vote for the Republican budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) to respond.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, let me respond to the gentleman. I am worried. I am worried that we will not maintain this momentum of fiscal responsibility.

Does the gentleman imply that the Senate is not worried about fiscal responsibility? The Spratt budget is very much like the Senate budget. That is why I suggest it is a doable budget. It is very much like the President's budget.

And would the gentleman not agree that the balanced budget agreement of just a few months ago reflected our concerns, was a responsible instrument? The Spratt budget is virtually the same as the balanced budget agreement. It continues the balanced budget agreement, it continues our commit to fiscal responsibility. That is why it is doable, and that is why the Republican budget is not doable, because it departs from the balanced budget agreement that we agreed to just a few months ago.

That was my point, and I think it is a very valid one, and the Senate happens to agree with us. That is why I want my colleagues to vote for this budget.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond.

Basically what he is saying is, ''You don't have to worry. Just keep going. Nothing needs to be changed. There's nothing wrong with what happens in Washington. There isn't one program that wastes money. There isn't one bureaucracy that needs to be changed. There isn't one program that needs to be reformed. There isn't one thing that needs to be done other than what we did last year to continue, just maintain the status quo.''

That is what the gentleman is saying.

Oh, last year's agreement was so good, we do not have to change a thing.

Well, go ahead and vote for that, and, as far as the Senate comment, do not make me answer whether or not we can do better than the Senate. We usually do as a body, and we will continue with this budget as well.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Democratic budget plan. This is really the best budget that we have seen for several years although it certainly does not have everything that any of us would like to see in a budget, but it has some things that most of us would like to see. The Republican budget lacks details, is mean-spirited because it still takes from the middle class and the poor, and it adds to the silver plate for the rich. The Democratic plan, however, gives $10 billion in tax cuts through entitlement initiatives, and it does not allow Republican cuts in health care, welfare to work, education, environmental protections, infrastructure, veterans and other programs critical to the health of our Nation.

We are in one of the most prosperous periods, yet in the midst of our celebration of our wealth we are ignoring and passing by a sizeable part of our American family. One-third of our population have less buying power than 20 years ago. Our schools and our cities, countryside and housing are in shambles, yet this House majority acts as if the majority of people in this country are millionaires.

The Democratic budget is a coalition budget which accommodates the values of a broader group of fellow Americans. I urge my colleagues to support the Spratt amendment.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FAZIO).

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, the New York Times calls it budget bologna. The Washington Post dubs it budget theatrics. Even the Senate Budget Chairman PETE DOMENICI, our longtime Republican leader there, calls it a mockery.

But no matter what it is labeled, the budget offered by the Republican leadership even at this late date is another example of their inability to conduct the Nation's business.

As we have heard today, there is little appetite for a budget, even among many Republicans in this House and certainly in the Senate, that would wipe out the Energy and Commerce Departments, privatize the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, eliminate the Legal Services Corporation and AmeriCorps, the national service program, and abolish a tax break for low income couples without children.

Although the outrage from the American public has forced retreat on some of these proposals, the latest offering from the Republican leadership continues to be unrealistic and radical. It deviates from last year's balanced budget plan so much so that Office of Management and Budget Director Frank Raines calls it a rank repudiation of the balanced budget agreement on which we shook hands just 1 year ago. This new plan makes deep cuts of $101 billion in domestic programs to pay for 101 billion in new tax breaks that primarily help upper income people, and it contradicts legislation that the House just passed to increase transportation spending by $22 billion by calling for a cut in highways and mass transit of $5 billion over 5 years.

This is patently ridiculous on its face.

☐ 1315

In many ways, this budget is similar to what House Republicans proposed in 1995. As you may remember, President Clinton refused to buckle under to pressures from the House leaders to sign a radical budget, and Republicans shut down the Federal Government twice before relenting. It is possible that that scenario could be repeated, if Speaker GINGRICH and the Republican leadership continue to play politics with this Federal budget and this process.

Last year we had a bipartisan agreement on spending that would keep our Nation's books balanced. We agreed on funding levels that would not put our Nation's neediest senior citizens at risk, and would boost our commitment to transportation, education, health care and the environment. If the Republican leadership walks away from this bipartisan agreement in an attempt to gain political points in this election year, they face a risky confrontation with those of us in Congress who demand that the government meet its needs with an honest budget blueprint.

The Spratt substitute is just that blueprint. It puts Social Security first, it protects Medicaid and Medicare, it allocates money so we can enact the Patient's Bill of Rights that will give Americans in HMOs the kind of care they deserve.

Instead of cutting funds for veterans, the environment and our police, it increases funding for drug enforcement, law enforcement, clean water and national parks. Instead of cutting education and highway funding, it calls for the hiring of 75,000 teachers to reduce class size, and fully funds the bill we passed here a few weeks ago to rebuild the nation's infrastructure.

Let us not repeat the debacle of 1995. Let us approve an honest plan, that keeps our budget balanced and does not put our vibrant economy at risk. We saw today how solid our employment statistics are, with low inflation. We ought not to be experimenting, creating an atmosphere in which we could once again balloon the deficit because we do not have the discipline that the Kasich budget would break.

Let us support the Spratt amendment. Let us reject this political charade. Let us stay the course and keep America moving in the direction that it has been moving under the Clinton Administration.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER).

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, first I want to commend the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for all of his work and effort in bringing to this Congress for a vote today a budget that is not only responsible, but also meets the priorities and the needs of the American people. It meets the needs of our families in the areas of education and health care.

That is a dramatic contrast to the budget that is being served up by the Republican majority. There they failed to set out priorities in education, they failed to set out priorities in health care, and one of the areas where they not only failed to set out priorities, but in fact provide substantial reductions and threats, is to our national environment and the programs provided to protect the environment of this Nation.

With an excessive $5 billion cut in the area of natural resources, they threaten programs to improve our water quality, to take care of the refuges, to take care of the recreational areas, the national parks and wilderness areas of this country that are visited by millions of Americans every year. They slashed the programs to acquire additional lands. Each and every year we do this, those lands become more expensive and harder to acquire to protect for the use of the American people.

We see that they have refused to provide monies to those agencies that are essential to protecting the revenues that the American people are entitled to for the use of their lands, revenues from mining companies that pay us no rent as they take billions of dollars of gold and platinum off of the public lands, the hundreds of millions of dollars and billions of dollars that the oil companies are underpaying the American taxpayers for the use of those lands as they take off billions of dollars in oil and gas resources from those lands.

The Republicans' answer is to slash the budget of those agencies that have oversight of that. Rather than charge those companies a fair rent, a fair charge for the use of the public resources, they would rather cut nutrition, they would rather cut health care, they would rather threaten Medicaid and Medicare, rather than making people pay their fair share.

The problem with all of this is it threatens the very resources that tens of millions of people in this country will be using this summer, our national parks, refuges and national forests. This budget is devastating to those environmental programs.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, last night when we closed debate on the rule, I was trying to figure out over the weekend an analogy which would demonstrate what this debate is really all about.

There are really two debates going on here. One is inside the Beltway, and one is outside the Beltway. Inside the Beltway we hear people saying we cannot tighten that Federal budget belt one notch.

Let me demonstrate. What I had my staff do was go out and get three belts. We put them together. What we have here is a nine foot belt. Every foot on this belt represents $1 trillion worth of Federal spending over the next five years. That is $9 trillion. That is a nine foot belt. I do not think anybody in this House could actually wear this belt.

All we are asking in the Kasich budget is for our friends on the appropriations committees to tighten this belt one notch, one inch out of a nine foot belt. Yet we hear from some of our friends here inside the Beltway that that cannot be done, that nine feet is not enough, that there is no waste, there is no fat, there is nothing left in the Federal budget that can be trimmed so that we can tighten this belt even one notch.

Now, inside the Beltway, I think to a lot of people on that side of the aisle, that debate makes sense. But I will tell you what, outside the Beltway in that great middle part of America, the places you call ''fly-over country,'' out there I think most Americans would look at this belt and they would think of this analogy, and they would say to me things like, ''You mean only one notch?''

But the great news is, if we can get our friends on the appropriations committees to tighten that belt just one notch, guess what? We can eliminate the marriage penalty tax. Every year over 21 million American families pay a penalty of almost $1,400 per family just because they are married.

My wife and I celebrate our wedding anniversary this week. We have been married 26 years now. I believe she still loves me, but I wish the IRS would stop tempting her to leave me. That is what happens to 21 million American couples. Every year they pay a penalty just for being married.

All we are asking here today is if we can possibly get our friends on the appropriations committees and our friends over in the other body to tighten this budget belt just one notch, so that we can eliminate the marriage penalty tax, so that my wife will not be tempted to leave me, and a lot of other spouses, not only of Members in this body, people all over the United States.

Let us eliminate the marriage penalty tax, let us protect Social Security, let us start paying down some of that debt, and let us eliminate some of the fat, the waste, the fraud and the abuse in the Federal budget so we can do the right thing, not only for American families but for future generations of Americans as well.

Mr. Chairman, I support the Kasich plan. I respect the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and the budget plan they are offering. I think the only plan that can pass is the one offered by Mr. KASICH and the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) for the purpose of a colloquy with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage in a colloquy with the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH).

Mr. Chairman, as you are well aware, H. Con. Res. 284 as passed out of your committee includes a budget savings allocation of $1.6 billion to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. This allocation would directly impact Federal workers and retirees.

While the current budget resolution does not detail specific program reduction recommendations, an earlier version specified that reductions should come from the Federal Employees Health Benefit Program, the FEHBP, and through increased retirement contributions past the current expenditure dates. It cannot help but be implicitly perceived as continuing to endorse such reduction in Federal retiree benefits, and, I might add, current employee benefits.

Mr. Chairman, it is I my understanding based on our earlier conversations that the Committee on the Budget will hold harmless the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight in the event the committee does not respond to its savings direction included in this budget resolution.

Could the gentleman comment and clarify this situation?

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman from Virginia is correct. Despite the fact that the budget resolution draft does not include specific assumptions, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight is reconciled for savings of about $1.6 billion. It is not our intent under this resolution that these savings be achieved by reducing benefits in the FEHBP or any of these other payer benefits of Civil Service or Postal Service employees or retirees.

The Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, notwithstanding these instructions, will not be held accountable for these reconciliation savings in the event the committee is unable to achieve its instructed savings.

Let me further say we would not go around the committee to the Committee on Rules in order to get that done. We will make sure we work with the Senate to make sure that $1.6 billion does not come out of those programs. But we will figure out a way in which to be able to make our marker without having to do this.

I also know that the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) are deeply concerned that when we get about the penny on the dollar, we be very cautious and compassionate about the way we do it, which is exactly how we will proceed. I understand the concerns of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), and want to make it clear that we will be very sensitive.

I also want to say to the gentleman from Virginia, it is our intent out of that one penny on a dollar to be able to get ourselves in a position of where we can make government more effective and more efficient and squeeze out an awful lot of the waste and duplication in order to get this job done.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman. I would just simply add that Federal employees are the greatest asset we have in this government. We need to properly compensate and incentivize this. I am comforted by the remarks of the chairman.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) the minority leader.

(Mr. GEPHARDT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, this budget is our common sense vision, our road map for a new century and a new economy. Our budget rejects the misguided and extreme policies and priorities of this Republican slash-and-burn budget and comes up with a moderate and responsible alternative.

The Republican leadership has put forward a budget that is so unfair and unwise that it is already dead on arrival. It is unacceptable, not only to many Democrats, but also to many Republicans as well.

I have been amused to hear the answers to questions about the budget. There is so little specificity because no one seems able to put the specificity behind the budget that it needs. So we hear, ''Well, that problem will be handled in conference.'' Translated, that means we are going to have the Domenici budget, I suppose, because everything is going to get settled in conference.

This Republican budget is expired milk poured into new cartons. It is more of the same fiscal radicalism based on the same irresponsible cuts which the American people specifically rejected in the election of 1996. Do not be fooled. This budget that we are voting on in the next few minutes is the same budget that we had in 1995 from the Contract on America.

The Republican path steers us into a dead end, where American families fend for themselves and are at the mercy of the global marketplace. They want to withdraw from our commitments to education, to health care and the environment, key areas critical to the future of our country and the prosperity of our people.

Democrats are united behind a different vision, the vision contained in the Democratic alternative. We want to build upon the economic success that we currently enjoy, a success that owes a lot to the Democratic budget of 1993, a budget that we passed without one Republican vote in the House or in the Senate. If it were up to the Republicans in Congress, we would not have made the wise and prudent fiscal choices that have brought about the strongest economy that we have seen in decades in this country.

□ 1330

We have more work that still needs to be done. Democrats want to meet the challenges presented to us by the changing economy and workplace. Government must play a limited, but critical role in ensuring that the growth we currently enjoy continues and its benefits are widely shared by all working families.

While Republicans talk about protecting Americans and their retirement, their budget threatens the safety and integrity of Social Security. The Democratic budget ensures that any surplus will be used to protect the foundation of retirement security for all Americans.

While Republicans talk a lot about the breakdown of the American family, the Democratic budget does something to actually address the problem. The Democratic budget makes a commitment to an act, the Patients Bill of Rights Act, so that families will receive the health care they need and pay for.

Our budget makes the investments in child care, which will enable Americans to balance the needs of their families with their demands from work.

The Democratic budget makes the smart investments in education that we desperately need to modernize and upgrade our public schools so our kids receive the knowledge and the skills they need to compete in a world marketplace.

While the Republicans profess to care about preserving the environment, their budget makes drastic cuts in environmental protection. Democrats are fighting to safeguard our natural heritage by increasing the funding of toxic waste cleanups and expanding parks and open spaces.

The Kasich budget has been repudiated by moderate Republicans. It has been renounced by the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE). It has been ridiculed by PETE DOMENICI, and it should be rejected by this Congress.

I urge my colleagues to support the Spratt substitute, the only honest and responsible budget alternative that has been before us.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to make something clear. I have some concerns about this resolution, especially with regard to the provisions which I believe single out Federal employees and retirees for unnecessary and unfair reductions.

I am encouraged by the statement of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) that the $1.6 billion in savings from the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight will not mean benefit reductions in the Federal employees health benefits program or any other pay or benefits of civil service or Postal Service employees or retirees.

With that assurance, I will vote for the resolution to move the process forward, but it does not mean that I will vote for it when it comes back in the conference report. I will weigh it then.

One other thing, if I could just get the gentleman's attention. I would urge the gentleman from Ohio that when he looks at the final agreement to remember the poorest and the most vulnerable in our country.

In the Bible, there are 244 references to the poor; 172 in the Old Testament, 72 in the New Testament. The oppressed are mentioned 45 times. I must tell the gentleman, in this whole body, both sides, that the passage of the highway bill, which was laden with pork barrel spending projects, was very troubling to me, especially the full court press lobbying efforts and the hiring of certain lobbyists to get certain projects in that bill.

I just wanted to say that the way the Congress, I believe, has pursued the recent highway bill, which funds $216 billion over the next 6 years for surface transportation, while transportation funding is necessary, I believe that the Congress got greedy, and we have effectively blown the budget caps and all that for a lot of special pork barrel projects.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH).

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman, I think he knows I started a fight against corporate welfare in this House, which I fight every day. That is because I made the argument that we just cannot take from one group. We cannot reform welfare for the poor without reforming welfare for the rich.

The fact of the matter is government is a final safety net for people who do not have anything. Where I come from, it is a sin not to help people who need help. But I also say it is always a sin to continue to help people who need to learn to help themselves.

I would say to the gentleman that we want to be very sensitive to this and not pick, as one person once said, on the weak clients in our society without having the guts to stand up and take on some of the special interests. As the gentleman knows, I share his concern in a number of areas, and I have worked hard, worked hard to try to ameliorate some of those rough edges and keep at it.

Mr. WOLF. Well, I appreciate the gentleman's comments. Next week, I will send the gentleman a letter on this issue that I would like to share. I know probably no one will read it, and many will think it is too preachy, but it will be a letter to the entire Republican caucus on this issue, which includes the passage of the unfortunate highway bill.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), my colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me. There is much concern in this House on both sides of the aisle with every budget that comes before us. It is a document. It is a political document which can become troublesome, particularly during election times.

However, it is the responsibility of us to pass a budget. It is our responsibility to read these budgets and to come up with the best particular budget that we can.

In reading over the Kasich budget, there was concern and there is concern that has been expressed in this House as to what is going to happen to TANF. That is welfare. It was this Republican Congress that passed welfare reform. We did it in cooperation with the governors in this country, in partnership with the governors of this country. We gave our word to the governors that we were going to hold the funding for 5 years, and that is exactly what we are going to do.

I chair the subcommittee that has jurisdiction over TANF, and I will give my word now to each Member in this Congress that we are not going to cut TANF this year. The final budget that comes out of Congress will exactly back us up on that particular matter. We have given our word. We keep our word.

Let us get on with this. Let us vote down the Spratt budget and vote up the Kasich budget.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains for both sides, and who has the right to close?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. NEY). The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) has 14 minutes remaining. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has 8½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) has the right to close.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, let us just go back for a second and think about what we are talking about here. Over the last 5 years, the Federal Government has spent $7.8 trillion. Over the next 5 years, we are scheduled to grow from $7.8 trillion to $9 trillion.

The American family would say, frankly, if we sat down with them and said, do we need to go from $7.8 trillion to $9.1 trillion, they probably would not serve us dinner that night.

We are not even asking to make any difficult or serious reduction in government. All we are suggesting is, instead of the government going from $7.8 trillion to $9.1 trillion, they go to $9 trillion.

We save a penny on the dollar. You cannot run away from it. You cannot escape it. You cannot hide from it. It is designed to save one penny on each dollar of Federal spending.

We take those savings, and do you know what we do with them, Mr. Chairman? We help the American family. We say that we want to get rid of this marriage penalty. We also want to work with the small business community to make it easier for them to thrive, because, you know, in some ways, the small business community is synonymous with the health of the American people.

So our approach here today is to try to trim some of the excess out of government, to make government more efficient and more effective. We do not see a reason why we need 150 separate job training programs and 340 programs in housing, including 103 that are inactive.

We do not see a reason why we should have an $800,000 outhouse in the Delaware Water Gap or to spend $584,000 per home in Yosemite. We certainly do not see a reason to spend $34 million to do closed captioning of the Jerry Springer Show and Bay Watch.

I mean, the fact is, in an institution that is the largest institution on the face of this globe, it is the one major institution on the face of this globe that has not undergone any downsizing.

What we have to ask ourselves today is can we begin to change the culture of Washington. Any time there has got to be some kind of a change, people jump up and say do not affect me. But we have got a choice. If we cannot affect the culture of Washington, if we cannot save a penny on a dollar, then we are telling the American family the government is more important than they are. That is not a message that any of us want to communicate out of this Chamber.

The fact is we all know intuitively, and of course we know by solid example, that, in fact, we can live under this heavy yoke of only $9 trillion in spending to be able to help our families.

In terms of the President's budget, folks, look, $150 billion in new spending and $130 billion in new taxes. He essentially is trying to reinvent the era of big government. In the Spratt budget, there are no tax cuts. They want to have more tax increases and blow through the spending caps and wreck the discipline that Alan Greenspan told us would hurt this economy.

The bottom line is it is a reasonable proposal. Do you know what I wish? Do you know who I wish was here today to vote on this? All the people outside of this Beltway who go to work for a living and struggle every day to make ends meet.

Members are sitting in their offices, and they are thinking about this vote, and ask yourself, can we save a penny on a dollar and communicate to our constituents that mom and dad and the kids are the most important thing going on in this society today?

In light of all the incidents that we have seen over the last couple of months, I think the answer is unquestionably yes. We just resist some of the culture. We just resist some of the people that are trying to trap us in this city, resist some of the people who say that America should be run from the top down.

Let us transfer power, money, and influence from this city back to the people so they are in charge in their communities to develop local solutions to local problems, strengthen the family, and strengthen the community, and build America from the bottom up.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes just to point out something. It is interesting, as we actually look through the Spratt proposal, and this is probably something that would surprise many people because of all of the rhetoric that we have heard here today. But interestingly enough, the Democrats cut Medicare.

They cut Medicare from the Republican budget; in fact, $600 million the first year, $300 million the second year, $400 million a third year, $300 million the fifth year. They cut Medicare.

These are the same folks who were down here in the well just a moment ago talking about how important health care was to them, and, yet, they are running around cutting Medicare. It is one thing to claim that you are cutting, and it is another thing to claim that you are actually being responsible.

I am sure there is a logical explanation for all of these Medicare cuts. I am sure they are going to claim it has something to do with fraud or waste or something like that. If that is what it is, of course I am amazed to find out all the Democrats can find within a Medicare budget is only $600 million worth of fraud.

But it just points out that sometimes the rhetoric that we hear on the floor does not meet the reality of the words and figures that are on the pages. There are things like that that make it very frustrating.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH).

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman, it is important that we have talked about the Clinton budget, but, frankly, we need to talk about what we are all about, why we took charge in 1995, what we came here to do as a majority party, joined with some of our friends on the other side of the aisle. We came to make the budget, government budget smaller and the family budget bigger.

☐ 1345

In order to do that, we are going to create a mechanism in this House that will create the reforms, the commonsense reforms, that the American people really want.

I would say to my Republican colleagues, we do not want to forget the reason why the people sent us here. It was to reduce government. It was to reduce regulation. It was to return power, money, and influence to the people. It was to make government more effective. It was to make government more efficient. It was to reject the notion that big government can solve our problems.

Do Members want to know something? That is what the people in the neighborhoods are saying today, give me a chance to get up to bat. Give me a chance to have some of my power back. Give me a chance to have some of my money back, and make the Federal Government more effective and more efficient, and stop having to take too much from me. Make it work.

I would say to the gentleman, this is the incentive we need to get this done. I want to suggest to the gentleman, we can change the culture. We can respond to what the people want and we can improve our country.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER), the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, who will engage in a colloquy with the chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me for the purposes of a colloquy that I might have with the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, to just put in the RECORD precisely what this budget document intends and what it will permit in the writing of a tax bill, to give relief in the amount of $101 billion that is provided in the budget document.

Mr. Chairman, I think there has been some degree of misunderstanding about this. It is my understanding, and I would like for this to be confirmed by the chairman, it is my understanding that, number one, this budget is designed to reduce the record tax burden on the American people. That is, we reduce that burden, and that we will have a balanced bill which will include a number of different items.

Certainly we should take action against the marriage penalty, reduce the complexity of the capital gains, pay down the debt, save Social Security, pass additional middle-income tax relief measures, create incentives for growth, savings, and job creation, so that as we have done in the past, we will put forward a bill of comprehensive tax relief in a balanced way.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARCHER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KASICH. Let me just say to the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, I would like to underscore with an exclamation point everything that he has said. That is precisely what our agenda is.

Frankly, I would like to say to the gentleman that I share his great frustration with a lot of the government estimators in this town who we have used for a long period of time to make sure we stay on a path, but frankly, who have been wildly inaccurate in terms of their projections of what was going to happen to this economy.

One interesting thing I would say to the chairman, the chairman of the Fed, Mr. Greenspan, came to the Committee on the Budget and made an argument at one point that if we zeroed out the capital gains tax it would not cost the government a dime.

What we have seen is by reducing the capital gains rate, it has generated more revenues, like most of us thought it would, the same way that when we repeal a luxury tax, we begin selling boats again in this country.

So I say to the gentleman, we are in sync. Both of us have a commitment to get to the same place: to empower people, be pro-growth, give people a fair shot, limit the growth of government, expand the personal power through tax relief.

I really look forward to the day, and it is coming soon, when we are going to have surpluses even in that general fund, where the gentleman from Texas (Chairman ARCHER) is going to be able to return those big high revenues that float into this city right back into the American people's pockets, rather than let people in this town have any incentive to think about spending them.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

(Mr. SPRATT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I began this debate by saying that the Kasich resolution is not realistic. I could not have given more graphic proof for my argument than what has just happened before our very eyes here in the House of Representatives, right here in the well of the House. We have seen this budget come unraveled, piece by piece. First of all, we started this morning.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRATT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina, did we not hear in the last few minutes the highway bill of $21 billion has not been accommodated in the budget?

Mr. SPRATT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GEPHARDT. The user fees have been renounced at about $8 billion to $10 billion?

Mr. SPRATT. This morning we passed a resolution renouncing the fees, but the Kasich bill has $8 to $10 billion in new user fees, $7 in all, in it. Presumably they are not going to repudiate their principle and impose user fees of their own when they have denounced the President for doing it.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Can I ask the gentleman if the agriculture research money we voted for last night was there?

Mr. SPRATT. Absolutely not. We passed a bill, it costs $2 billion, and it is not accommodated in this budget.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Can I ask the gentleman about the veterans' expenses, which was included in the transportation bill?

Mr. SPRATT. When we passed the highway bill we repealed some veteran benefits, and in return, to palliate, we added $1.6 billion to the Montgomery G.I. bill. It is not in this bill. Instead, this bill still has a remnant that is out of date. It calls on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to reconcile another $10 billion. They take a double whammy, a double hit.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Did I not hear, can I ask the gentleman, that Federal employee cuts were restored in the last few minutes?

Mr. SPRATT. Right here a few minutes ago the gentleman saw them restore it. It validates what I have said. These cuts are not realistic. They will not happen. They undid them right here on the House floor.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRATT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the gentleman quickly about the back and forth on TANF. Does not the budget resolution say that there shall be a $10 billion reduction in Function 600?

Mr. SPRATT. It does indeed, and I do not know where it will come, except for TANF. This is another example of the budget resolution saying it will, and then Members getting up here and saying it will not, and then voting for a document that says it will; such contradictory statements.

Mr. GEPHARDT. If the gentleman will further yield, Mr. Chairman, I will say that Senator DOMENICI called this budget a mockery. That is what has happened today on the floor with this budget.

Mr. SPRATT. We say it has a $50 black hole, and it is getting bigger by the minute.

Mr. Chairman, less than a year ago the House approved the balanced budget agreement of 1997. It was a good agreement, a bipartisan agreement. It built on the Clinton budget of 1993, which wiped out the deficit, and paved the road for surpluses as far as the eye can see.

Our resolution, the Spratt resolution, the Democratic resolution, sticks by that agreement. The spending totals, the revenue totals, all of our numbers are in sync with the balanced budget agreement. We save the surpluses because we want to save Social Security. We spare Medicare from further cuts. In fact, we broaden its coverage, because we believe in Medicare.

We protect Medicaid because we believe in Medicaid, and particularly the children's health insurance program, because we are proud of that achievement in the balanced budget agreement last year. We think it would be unconscionable to tell children and their parents that they have coverage at last, only to jerk it away from them the next year.

We fund key initiatives in education, in child care, and call for $30 billion in tax relief, tilted towards working families.

There is one thing of particular fiscal importance in this bill, in this resolution. On September 30, when we close the books on fiscal 1998, the Federal Government will show a surplus for the first time in 30 years, a surplus of $40 to $60 billion. That surplus was hard-earned, and we think we should husband it.

Sure, we proposed some initiatives in education and child care because these are the things we believe in, but we offer offsets to pay for these initiatives. We do not take a single dollar out of the surplus. We say, instead, that the surplus should be saved, held in a reserve fund, as it were, to save Social Security for the long run.

Over the last several years this government has enjoyed a surge of revenues, but until we know that surge is permanent and recurring, until we have taken the next step, the giant steps necessary to ensure the solvency of Medicare and Social Security for the long run, we are wary of cutting back revenues deeply and drawing down this surplus.

In the balanced budget agreement, we have provided for tax relief. We think there is room for more. We think the tax code is full of deductions, credits, exemptions, and preferences that could stand a scrub. We recommend that the Committee on Ways and Means search the code for $30 billion in unwarranted tax benefits, call them what we will, and redistribute the tax burden just a bit more in favor of working families.

Surely we can do this much to help hard-working families. Surely we can do this much to help hard-working families afford the cost of child care and to mitigate the so-called marital tax penalty.

We ourselves have scrubbed spending to come up with $10 billion in cuts over the next 5 years. This is a small sum, but we think the money can do more good if it is used to help school districts, reduce the pupil-teacher ratio in grades 1 through 3, or if it is used to fund the early learning fund.

Here are a few of the other things we propose: broadening the coverage of Medicare so those between 55 and 65 can buy into it. Here are a few of the things we propose in the context of a balanced budget: improving the child care tax credit so it applies to families with incomes up to $60,000, so that families of four with incomes of $35,000 or less will have no tax liability if they take full use of the credit, passing a patient's Bill of Rights.

So our budget sounds some new themes, but they are all fully offset and paid for. At bottom, this is a balanced budget agreement which the House passed overwhelmingly last year. If Members ask me to tell them in a sentence what this substitute does, I will tell them. It restores the budget to reality. It restores funds that the Kasich resolution takes.

If they ask me in a sentence to tell them what this budget does, I will tell them, it restores this budget to reality. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) presents this budget as a 1 percent cut in spending, but since the largest accounts in the budget, Social Security and defense and debt service, are not cut, they are increased, the accounts that are cut take heavy hits.

The remaining cuts are far, far greater than 1 percent. By our calculation, the Kasich budget will cut domestic discretionary spending by at least 6 percent, on top of the 12 percent in cuts already dictated by the balanced budget agreement, and still being administered. Bob Reischauer, whom we respect on both sides of the aisle, has pointed out that really about half of discretionary spending is not subject to cuts. It is essential administrative functions of the government, the FBI.

This means that to achieve the cuts the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) is talking about, the cuts will have to go as deep as 36 percent. As one Member, the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) on the other side of the aisle, said, this will mean deep cuts in some programs and the extinction of others.

Which programs are in the crosshairs? Law enforcement gets cut $8 billion, education nearly $5 billion, the environment $5 billion. It goes on and on and on.

☐ 1400

Our resolution is not a duplicate of the resolution that passed the other body, but we are close enough to bridge the differences in a concurrent resolution. We give Members a responsible choice. We stick close to the bipartisan Balanced Budget Agreement and we cut the clearest path to a concurrent resolution.

There are many reasons this resolution should be the budget resolution this House passes, but if Members voted for the Balanced Budget Agreement, if they want to see a budget resolution become a concurrent resolution, if they want to save the surplus for Social Security, if they want to protect Medicare and Medicaid, they should vote for this and reject the Kasich budget.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGRICH), the Speaker of the House.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, let me say that I think that this is in some ways as historic a vote as the votes of the last three or four years. It did not start out this way this year. We had a budget agreement that was going to last for five years. I commend the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) who helped with that last year. It was an historic bipartisan agreement.

But then Washington just could not allow things to go on in a normal implementation. The President, for good and legitimate reasons, sent up a budget that had much higher spending. It had higher taxes. We just voted a while ago and this entire House, I believe unanimously with the exception of one Member, voted against all the tax increases the President sent up.

But it was clear to us, and I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman KASICH), because he from a very early point sensed what was happening. The pressures in this city for more spending, for higher taxes, the pressures in this city to avoid reforming the system, the pressures to say the bureaucracy is perfect, we cannot find any money, we cannot change anything, just give us more of the American people's money, let us have more power in Washington, those pressures were building.

I am told that today, and I do not know if they have done it, but I am told that today the Federal Communications Commission may vote a tax, something which in all of American history has never occurred. A constitutional abrogation of power to a group of bureaucrats, appointed figures, who will tax every telephone line in America. Because in this city if we do not tame it, if we do not get it under control, if we do not fight for the taxpayers, this city grows every day and it takes more money and more power and it says, ''Come to Washington and beg the bureaucrats to get your own money back.''

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) came to us and said, ''You know, we ought to make a big effort to establish the principle that we are going to be for lower taxes and lower spending. That Washington is not tamed yet.''

Some might say why would we listen to the gentleman? The fact is, and it is one of the great stories that is not covered very much in this city because it makes this city so comfortable, that 3 years of our effort is working.

We passed welfare reform and my good friends on the left got up and opposed it. We passed it three times. It was vetoed twice. Guess what? Welfare reform is working and in 49 States welfare rolls are lower. In New York City welfare roles are the lowest they have been since 1967 because reforms are working.

Then we said let us cut domestic discretionary spending. And let me say that the Committee on Appropriations led by the gentleman from Louisiana (Chairman LIVINGSTON) was brilliant. And while everybody on the left yelled and screamed, we cut out $103 billion, we closed down over 300 small programs and we saved the American people money.

And then we said let us get to a balanced budget. And I remember how the people on the left and the news media laughed at the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) when he said let us get to a balanced budget. And then we said let us get to it by 2002 and we were told, oh, that is too soon.

Then we said let us get to it and cut taxes. Let us save enough money by reforming enough government to cut taxes and balance the budget, and we were told that was impossible. Guess what we did? We passed a balanced budget with smaller government and lower taxes, and what was the result? We cut capital gains tax and, as we predicted, we raised more revenue because more people cashed in their capital gains, and in April alone there was $12 billion more from capital gains that came into this city at a lower tax rate, which I would argue means we ought to go to a 15 percent capital gains rate and get even more money. So my liberal friends could actually get more money out of the rich with lower capital gains because we have real proof, but their ideology would not permit that.

Then we said what if we were to balance the budget and lower interest rates? Guess what happened? We balanced the budget and the Federal Reserve has kept interest rates low. What is the result? Chrysler last month sold more cars than in any month in its history. Why? Because interest rates are lower, the economy is growing, taxes have been cut, people are at work. We have the lowest unemployment rate. We have the lowest interest rate. We have cut taxes. We are balancing the budget, not in 2002, we are balancing the budget in 1998, four years ahead of schedule.

Now, one would think with that kind of track record we could come to our friends and we could say to them why do we not work together? Oh, reform the bureaucracy? The unions would not like that. Shrink government in Washington? The liberals would not like that. Return power to the American people? The ideologues would not like that. Reduce the number of lawsuits? The trial lawyers would not want that.

So here is the choice: Is this budget perfect? No, this is a human budget written in a human institution by people working their hearts out. Will it be improved in conference? I suspect it will, because we will meet with our good friends in the Senate who were our partners in welfare reform, which is working; in cutting taxes, which is working; in saving spending, which is working; in lowering interest rates, which is working; and in balancing the budget, which is working. And with our partners, we will write a budget.

We will bring it back to the House and hopefully a few Democrats will have the courage to vote for all the things that are working. Then we will work with the President, and by this September we will get an agreement, I think at the latest in early October, and it will be good for America.

But if Members vote ''no'' on the Kasich budget, they are voting against the team that reformed welfare. They are voting against the team that cut taxes. They are voting against the team that balanced the budget. They are voting against the team that brought domestic discretionary spending under control, and I think that is wrong.

Let me say one other thing. We need, over time, not only lower taxes and a smaller government in Washington, but contradictory as it will sound to some, we need a stronger defense. We need a stronger defense with a reformed Pentagon. We need to have as much courage at saying yes, our young men and women deserve good equipment; there ought to be enough of them to do everything the President wants without wearing them out; and they ought to have the best training in the world. We should have enough procurement.

Mr. Chairman, we are going to revisit that issue over the next six months. The lesson of Pakistan, the lesson of India is a lesson that the world is dangerous and America has to be strong. The lesson of Bosnia and Kosovo and Iraq and the Middle East and North Korea is that the world is dangerous and the United States has to be strong.

But as we approach defense spending, we are going to be for stronger spending with less bureaucracy, with more accountability. And I believe we can get to that, and I believe in the end the President will work with us to get to a bipartisan consensus that America has to have a big enough defense, with modern enough weapons, with good enough training to be able to lead the entire world.

So I would simply say to my friends, the Democrats, their leadership has to offer a liberal budget. It is okay. They were not with us on welfare reform and it was okay. They were not with us on tax cuts and it was okay. So do not flinch. The same principles that have worked for 3½ years, that have given us the lowest interest rates, the lowest unemployment, the best take-home pay, those principles are going to work again.

Defeat the liberal budget and then help us pass a good workmanlike budget. Let us get to conference and continue to improve it, and let us keep moving this country forward in the right way.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in defense of fiscal responsibility and in support of the Democratic Budget Resolution. The Congress has traveled a long road to restore fiscal discipline to the budget process. This process started in 1990 when the Congress passed the first of three deficit reduction packages and continued in 1993 and 1997. The Democratic Budget Resolution builds on that last agreement that we worked so hard to achieve.

The Balanced Budget Agreement of 1997, reached just nine months ago, made some very tough cuts. We agreed then to cut spending by $300 billion over five years and $1 trillion over 10 years. We cut $115 billion from Medicare, $13 billion from Medicaid, and $172 billion from other programs. At the same time, we met our national security needs and made critical investments in education, children's health care, and environmental protection in order to keep our economy strong and address challenges facing our families. It also provided for $95 billion in tax cuts over five years, including education tax initiatives to help families afford college costs, a child tax credit, and reductions in the capital gains and estate taxes.

Building on the Balanced Budget Agreement of 1997 is still the responsible course of action. The Spratt substitute does just that. It is an honest blueprint for the nation's fiscal policy, which conforms with the spending levels set in Balanced Budget Act of 1997.

As I said very early this morning, the Republican budget resolution diverges from the path of fiscal responsibility and does not acknowledge reality. It underscores the Republicans inability to govern, hence their desire to debate their resolution at a time when most of the country is asleep.

The Democratic Budget Resolution does not play games. It does not hide draconian spending cuts in blue smoke and mirrors. It is not built on a pithy slogan that is misleading and inaccurate.

It is built on making crucial investments in education, medical research, health care for children, environmental protection and other vital programs, This budget resolution spells out how to pay for these investments and a $30 billion dollar marriage penalty tax cut. Most importantly, this budget resolution saves future surpluses to shore up the solvency of the Social Security Trust Fund.

Our budget resolution recognizes the fact that we have a $5.4 trillion debt and that we spend $250 billion on interest annually. Today, 3.1 percent of GDP goes toward paying the interest on our debt. Under the Democratic Budget Resolution, interest payments on the debt will fall to 2.1 percent of GDP in the year 2003. According to the GAO, if we spend the surpluses as the Republican Budget Resolution does, the debt will rise by $890 billion dollars over the next 15 years.

If we abandon fiscal discipline, CBO projects that federal debt will exceed 100 percent of GDP by 2040. That is about twice as high as the current ratio and is a level previously reached only at the end of World War II. Maintaining the status quo without spending the surpluses would save us nearly one trillion dollars over 15 years.

These facts fly in the face of the math that the Majority has been peddling. Three quarters of the budget is exempt from cuts including interest payments, federal military and civilian retirement, Social Security, defense spending and other portions of the budget. Promising a tax cut is unaffordable, disingenuous and will result in long term structural budget deficits.

In fact, $100 billion tax cut requires an 18.9 percent real cut in non-defense discretionary spending. The Balanced Budget Agreement of 1997 already requires similar cuts. The Majority's cuts on top of last year's cuts are just unrealistic. As a result, tax cuts will be enacted first, spending cuts that should come later will never materialize, and in effect, the surpluses will have been wasted.

Included in our $5.4 trillion debt is $600 billion of Treasury bonds owned by the Social Security trust fund that will have to be retired after 2013. The Democratic budget resolution pays down the debt, which in turn reduces interest and principal costs to ultimately strengthen the Social Security Trust Fund.

If we squander the surplus without beginning to retire the national debt to a more manageable level, in the long run, we may have to borrow more to pay off bonds as they come due, including to Social Security, and we will be shortchanging the American people. Without maintaining a course of fiscal discipline, the Congress' hard work since 1990 will be compromised. Federal budget surpluses will be short lived and we will return to deficit spending.

Given the impending retirement boom, that's not the direction in which we want to move. I urge my colleagues to support the Spratt substitute.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Alternative Budget proposal offered by my colleague Representative SPRATT. This Democratic budget alternative is faithful to the fiscally responsible, bipartisan Balanced Budget Act passed by the House last year. This alternative budget does not make drastic new cuts in Medicaid, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, the Earned Income Tax Credit, education and other vital priorities, as the Republican Budget Resolution does. The Democratic alternative does not focus new cuts on working families, the poor, the young and the old, as the Republican Budget Resolution does.

The Democratic alternative offered by Representative SPRATT respects the agreement this House reached with the Senate last year, and it addresses critical priorities in our nation. The Democratic alternative dedicates the budget surplus to Social Security to protect our seniors; it funds additional public school teachers and school construction initiatives for our young people. These are widely supported programs, and they answer the crucial needs of seniors and young people. The Democratic alternative is responsible and invests in our future. I urge my colleagues to support the Democratic alternative budget proposal.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Kasich budget and in strong support of the substitute amendment offered by the Ranking Member of the Budget Committee, Mr. SPRATT.

When the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee called the House Republican budget ''a mockery'' he not only described the substance of the Kasich budget but also the procedure by which it is being considered. Today the House is considering the budget resolution 51 days after the April 15 statutory deadline—the most delinquent budget process in 16 years. The appropriations committees of the House and Senate have long since dismissed the budget resolution as irrelevant and are already busily marking up legislation for the coming fiscal year. Against that backdrop, a reasonable person might conclude that the Budget Committee would propose a resolution that stood a reasonable chance of being expeditiously adopted.

Sadly, this is not the case. By radically departing from last year's bipartisan budget accord, the House Republican leadership has managed to totally isolate itself not just from the President and the Democrats in Congress but also from their Senate counterparts and even many House Republicans. Indeed, some of the harshest criticism of this budget has come not from Democrats but from Republicans. In addition to Senator DOMENICI's comments, Senator STEVENS said that under the cuts proposed in the Kasich budget, ''I don't think Congress could function.'' A group of House Republicans wrote that the cuts proposed in the Kasich budget are ''neither desirable nor attainable.''

Fortunately, there is a constructive alternative. Like the budget passed by the Senate last month, the Spratt budget keeps faith with the bipartisan Balanced Budget Act of 1997. The Spratt budget adheres to the discretionary budget caps, offsets tax cuts within the revenue code and pays for priority initiatives with reductions in entitlement programs. Most importantly, by continuing to steer the path of fiscal responsibility. The Spratt alternative fully safeguards the budget surplus until Congress and the President enact legislation to ensure the long term future of Social Security.

I say to my colleagues—especially on the other side of the aisle—who wish to build upon the work of the 1997 budget agreement, to reserve the surplus for Social Security, and to support a budget that can be reconciled with the Senate and adopted, I urge you to support the Spratt alternative.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Spratt Amendment because it is a rational approach to meeting the needs of our society. For example, it provides for 75,000 new teachers, it allows people under 65 to buy into Medicare, $1.2 billion for child care and early childhood education, $600 million for Medicaid, including an outreach program for children and provides an option to cover all legal immigrant children.

It provides for a patient Bill of Rights Act and tax credits for businesses that provide child care services to their employees. It saves all the budget surpluses for five years until a comprehensive Social Security Financial Plan is agreed upon.

The Spratt Amendment is honest, responsible and addresses the needs of the American People.

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of Mr. SPRATT's substitute to the misguided Republican budget resolution. Unlike the Republican proposal, the Spratt substitute meets the requirements of last year's balanced budget agreement without calling for the deep and drastic cuts to critical programs, both mandatory and discretionary, that the majority has included in its plan.

The Spratt substitute ensures that the needs of America's children and working men and women will continue to be met, by providing for billions more in education and training funding than the Republican proposal. In addition, the Spratt budget provides health care funding that will protect maternal and child health, enable the continuation of important research at the National Institutes of Health and the Centers for Disease Control, and provide grants under the Ryan White AIDS program. Mr. Spratt's plan calls for law enforcement spending that will help keep drugs off our streets and out of our communities, and that will fund important crime reduction initiatives. And the substitute provides increased funding for programs that will protect our precious environment and natural resources.

Furthermore, the Spratt substitute includes several major initiatives that will benefit our nation's children. The proposal provides funding which would allow the hiring of 75,000 new teachers to reduce classroom size, sets aside substantial funds for child care and early learning, and includes a Medicaid outreach program for children. There is no more important task than ensuring that the health and education needs of our children are met, and I am pleased that the Spratt budget recognizes this priority.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of the Spratt substitute. it is not a perfect proposal, but it is one which will enable us to move on with the budget process. This substitute, because of its close similarities to the Senate budget resolution, its the best vehicle with which to reach an agreement with the other body that will allow our respective appropriations subcommittees to continue their difficult tasks with a framework to guide them. Let us adopt this substitute, keeping within the boundaries of last year's balanced budget agreement and ensuring that our children, our working families, and our most vulnerable citizens are protected rather than abandoned.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. NEY). All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 164, noes 257, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 209]

AYES—164

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cummings
Davis (IL)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Hooley
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (WI)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Lee
Levin
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McIntyre
McNulty
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Mink
Moakley
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Sanchez
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Tauscher
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Velazquez
Vento
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOES—257

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Berry
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
Mascara
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Moran (KS)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Riggs
Riley
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Roukema
Royce
Rush
Ryun
Salmon
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—13

Ballenger
Bilbray
Furse
Gonzalez
Johnson, E. B.
Kennedy (MA)
Lewis (GA)
McDade
Meek (FL)
Mollohan
Ros-Lehtinen
Sabo
Tanner

☐ 1427

Mr. DAVIS of Florida, and Mr. RUSH changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. WISE, and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. NEY). The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, it is with great regret that I rise today to oppose the Republican budget resolution and the Democratic substitute. Unfortunately, both of these proposals stray from last year's historic balanced budget agreement, and neither of them does enough to reduce our national debt and ensure Social Security's solvency.

The Republican proposal is fiscally irresponsible and economically unfeasible. Rather than following the guidelines of last year's Balanced Budget Agreement, as did the Senate budget resolution, the House Republicans have chosen to cut discretionary funding to such programs as veterans health, long-term care for the elderly, and anti-crime initiatives by over $45 billion. These cuts, according to Senate Republicans including Budget Committee Chairman DOMENICI, are unwise and would devastate many important programs for our nation's senior citizens. These cuts, according to Senate Republicans, could derail the budget process. Some—Republicans and Democrats—suggest that they could lead to another government shutdown.

Furthermore, the House Republican budget does not preserve the projected surplus for Social Security. Instead, it actually changes budget rules to allow the surplus to be spent on new programs, including tax cuts. Given our nation's $5.3 billion in debt (as of May 31, 1998), not allowing the surplus to be spent on paying off our debt is harmful to our economy and to our taxpayers.

The Democratic budget alternative, while it is much more fiscally prudent and sensible, still does not do enough to fit the guidelines of last year's Balanced Budget Agreement. In my view, its new spending should be devoted to deficit reduction.

The one budget proposal that would have met all these objectives—the Blue Dog budget proposal—was not allowed to be considered on the House Floor. Due to concerns that this budget resolution might garner enough votes to defeat other proposals, the House Committee on Rules would not allow this legislation to be brought to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, the Blue Dog Budget Resolution would have been good for this Congress, and good for all Americans. I am proud to support it, and disappointed that the will of Congress was not heard on this important issue.

Outlined below are the specifics of the Blue Dog budget resolution:

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Saves 100% of the projected unified budget surplus ($24 billion in FY 99 and $225 billion over five years) for Social Security, and recommends that the unified budget surplus be reserved to fund the costs of Social Security reform legislation.

Reaffirms the principle that budget discipline should be maintained until the budget is balanced without relying on the annual surplus in the Social Security trust fund to mask an on-budget deficit.

Maintains discretionary spending at the levels included in the bipartisan budget agreement. Provides increases in functions for education, veterans, health care, research and other functions that were designated as priority functions in the bipartisan budget agreement. Allows for consideration of tax cuts if they are offset with mandatory spending cuts or increases in other revenues. Does not change budget rules to allow tax cuts to be offset by reductions in discretionary spending.

Identifies mandatory offsets that were not included in the transportation conference report that Congress could use to fund new mandatory investments or deficit reduction.

Incorporates the changes in spending from the TEA–21 Conference Report and conference report on S. 1150, the Agriculture Research, Extension and Education Conference Report, as estimated by CBO, in order to provide a credible budget blueprint that reflects the realities of Congressional action.

Does not reopen Medicare, Medicaid, federal retirement and other mandatory programs for additional reductions.

Does not count on revenues from tobacco legislation that many not materialize, but preserves the flexibility of Congress to consider tobacco legislation that provides funding for programs related to the tobacco settlement.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The Blue Dog budget saves 100% of the unified budget surplus for Social Security. The resolution contains a strong statement that Congress and the President should strive to truly balance the budget, without using the surplus from the Social Security Trust Fund. The resolution also states that Congress should use any accumulated or projected unified budget surplus to pay for the transition costs of Social Security reform.

TAX CUTS

The Senate Budget Resolution contained a tax cut reserve which would allow—but not require—Congress to enact additional mandatory savings and/or revenue increases for the purpose of tax cuts. The Blue Dog alternative would clarify that Congress could also use additional savings for debt reduction.

MANDATORY INVESTMENTS RESERVE

The Senate budget resolution included a transportation spending reserve that identified a variety of spending cuts that could be used to pay for increased spending on highways and mass transit. The highway conference report used most of the offsets identified in the Senate resolution, but there were a few offsets identified in the Senate resolution that were not used in the highway conference. The Blue Dog alternative would change the transportation spending reserve into a mandatory spending reserve that would allow—but not require—Congress to use the unused offsets that Senator DOMENICI identified for transportation (approximately $3.5 billion) for new mandatory investments. As with the tax cut reserve, the alternative would not spell out which, if any, initiatives Congress should fund with this reserve. The Senate Budget Resolution, with which we concur, identified the following area as key investments: child care, children's health education and research.

BUDGETARY IMPACT OF THE TRANSPORTATION AND AGRICULTURE RESEARCH CONFERENCE AGREEMENTS

The Blue Dog resolution incorporates the changes in spending from the TEA–21 Conference Report and conference report on S. 1150, the Agriculture Research, Extension and Education Conference Report, as estimated by CBO. The Blue Dog substitute does not endorse or reject the spending levels of the transportation bill, but incorporates the costs of legislation already enacted by Congress into the budget resolution in order to provide a credible budget blueprint. Likewise, including the budgetary impact of the agriculture research conference report is not an endorsement of the specific policies therein, but simply reflects the budgetary impact of the anticipated passage of that bill by increasing the allocation to Function 350, Agriculture and reducing the allocation for Function 600, Income Security to that would result from the enactment of S. 1150.

DISCRETIONARY BUDGET PRIORITIES

The discretionary allocations in the substitute are virtually identical to the Senate-passed resolution, with slight modifications within the discretionary spending limits established by the budget agreement. In response to the cut in spending for Veterans benefits in the TEA–21 conference report, the Blue Dog substitute increases the allocation for spending on discretionary programs in function 700, Veterans Benefits and Compensation, to allow spending on veterans health care to keep up with inflation. The Blue Dog resolution also contains higher discretionary spending in Medicare than the Senate-passed resolution by eliminating proposed fees on hospitals that are in the Senate resolution and has higher funding for discretionary programs in function 350, Agriculture and Rural Development.

These increases in discretionary allocations are offset by reducing the allocations for function 250, Science, Space and Technology and function 300, Natural Resources and the Environment below the allocations in the Senate-passed resolution.

The Senate-passed resolution increased discretionary spending in both of these functions substantially above the allocations in the Balanced Budget Agreement; even with the reductions the Blue Dog substitute still provides more funding in these functions than the budget agreement.

TOBACCO RESERVE

The Blue Dog substitute modifies the tobacco revenue reserve from the Domenici resolution to allow for consideration of tobacco legislation that used revenues from a tobacco settlement to fund programs related to the tobacco settlement. The Blue Dog resolution would not make any assumptions about the passage of tobacco legislation. The resolution would simply include language establish a reserve fund that would allow the budget allocations to be adjusted if Congress considers deficit neutral tobacco legislation that uses the revenues from the tobacco settlement to extend the solvency of the Medicare trust fund and address tobacco-related issues, such as providing assistance for tobacco farmers and communities, creating smoking cessation and prevention programs, curbing teenage smoking, assisting States with the costs of treating tobacco-related illnesses, providing health care for veterans with tobacco related illnesses and funding federal medical research.

MEDICARE

The Blue Dog substitute includes a Sense of Congress provision encouraging the Ways and Means Committee to consider budget-neutral Medicare provisions that would address regional disparities in Medicare reimbursements and to examine the concerns of the home health care and hospital industries regarding implementation of Medicare policies.

CPI ACCURACY

The Blue Dog resolution does not include any proposals regarding CPI, but would contain a Sense of Congress provision encouraging BLS to continue to improve the accuracy of the CPI, particular with regard the remaining upper-level substitution bias.

Mr. Speaker, the Blue Dog proposal I have outlined today would have been the sensible middle ground in the budget debate. The legislation had bipartisan support—and its passage would have put an end to the partisan rhetoric and demagoging that we have heard on this issue today.

The American people want a budget—they do not want endless arguments and political posturing. The Blue Dog budget would have provided Congress with a reasonable compromise. It is indeed unfortunate that the Republican majority did not allow its consideration today.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my deep and serious concerns about the budget resolution brought to the floor today by the Republican Leadership.

First, let me say that I have nothing but respect for my colleague from Ohio, Mr. KASICH, and the work he has done during his tenure as Chairman of the Budget Committee. However, I believe the budget resolution produced by his committee follows a misguided set of priorities and would move our country in the wrong direction.

I am particularly concerned about the large tax cuts called for in this resolution. The measure provides for more than $100 billion in tax cuts over the next five years. I feel that the best tax cut for the American family is a balanced federal budget. Balancing the budget—and keeping it balanced—leads to lower interest rates, more job creation, and strong economic growth. With projections showing the federal budget will be balanced for the first time in almost 30 years, we should not risk returning to the era of deficit spending by enacting massive tax cuts at this time.

I am also concerned about plans to pay for these tax cuts by cutting more than $45 billion in discretionary spending. While I am tremendously pleased that we have finally managed to balance the budget, and I voted for the spending cuts enacted last year, we must realize that discretionary spending has already absorbed crippling cuts. In 1962, discretionary spending accounted for more than two-thirds of all federal spending. Today, discretionary spending accounts for about one-third of the federal budget, while mandatory spending takes up just under two-thirds of the budget.

The budget resolution asks us to continue this trend by cutting more than can be reasonably expected from discretionary spending programs, while doing virtually nothing to reform the entitlement programs that have grown so fast over the past thirty years.

Therefore, I believe we should resist calls to enact massive tax cuts and focus instead on balancing the federal budget and keeping it balanced. The spending cuts contained in last year's balanced budget agreement kept us squarely on the path to fiscal responsibility, which was begun in 1993. We will be far better off if we do nothing, and stick to that agreement, than if we follow the recommendations contained in the budget resolution we are considering today. And if, as projected, this year's budget should produce a surplus, I am committed to the following three priorities:

First, we should take steps to reform and provide for the long-term fiscal health of Social Security, Medicare, and other federal retirement programs without increasing the payroll tax.

Second, I believe it is absolutely imperative that we begin paying down the massive federal debt. Since 1980, the gross federal debt has grown more than five times in size to nearly $5.5 trillion. Today, the debt is two-thirds the size of our nation's Gross Domestic Product, and interest payments on the debt consume 15 cents of every dollar in federal spending.

Think about how much better off we would be if this money did not have to be spent on interest payments. For every $1 billion in debt we retire, we would save $55 million each year in interest payments. Most economists say that reducing the debt, and thereby shrinking interest payments, would reduce interest rates, increase savings rates, keep the tax burden down, and make more money available in both the public and private sectors to fuel continued economic growth.

Finally, we should be investing more in this country's economic infrastructure—such as roads, inland waterways, sewage treatment plants, and airports—in order to make American workers and businesses more productive and profitable.

Improving roads, updating sewer systems, modernizing airports, and making sure our communications system is ready for the 21st century enhances our international competitiveness and helps American workers remain the most productive in the world.

Despite the obvious benefits, many infrastructure projects are not receiving adequate funds or are simply being ignored. For instance, a 1995 Department of Transportation study found that nearly one-third of the roads in this country are in poor or mediocre condition. The Department of Defense estimates that it will be at least 12 years before adequate housing can be built for every soldier in the U.S. armed forces. The Environmental Protection Agency estimates the federal government will need to invest more than $275 billion to meet the nation's water and sewer system needs over the next 20 years.

Mr. Speaker, we have a moral responsibility to provide a solid and fiscally secure future for the generations that will follow us. The Republican budget resolution fails to provide a bright future for our children and grandchildren, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, as I stand here, I can't decide whether people should be laughing or crying. Is it low farce or dark tragedy to spend time doing the people's business debating a budget that virtually everyone knows is already dead? Today we debate the Budget Committee Majority's sorry, no account, buy today-pay tomorrow, credit card budget. In doing so, most Members on both sides of the aisle have been made reluctant participants in the spectacle of arguing over a corpse.

The Republican leadership seems to have concluded that since we have brought the budget deficit under control it is time to engage in the same sort of shenanigans that got us that deficit in the first place. And why not? Budget deficits have been very, very good to the Republican majority.

Mr. Clinton and Mr. GORE have brought us a smaller government and our booming economy and the 1993 budget agreement have led to a balanced budget. As a result, the Republicans don't have much reason for being. They have become the one trick pony of American politics whose sole excuse for political existence is to rail against irresponsible government excess. It is hard to show excess if there isn't a deficit, so Mr. KASICH's budget promises tax cuts today and pays for them with unspecified, politically unpalatable spending reductions somewhere out in the future. His budget would again put us on a path for deficits. I guess the Republican leadership believes that they can slip this by Americans with a lot of arm waving and thin promises of big tax cuts. I think that our citizens are smarter than that.

If this budget were ever to become the official congressional position, and I don't believe there is anyone in this room or in the other body who thinks for a minute that it will, it would require that we make radical cuts in transportation, housing, education and research programs. These are the very programs that improve the quality of life in this country today and promise a brighter life tomorrow. These are the same programs we have been cutting and freezing and cutting again for ten years as we wrestled with the deficit.

In Mr. KASICH's leaked plan his $100 billion in savings comes from dredging up such tired old turkeys as eliminating the Departments of Commerce and Energy and selling the Power Marketing Administrations—proposals that have been debated and repudiated time and again. Over five years, the Kasich plan would also have us terminate the advanced technology program and manufacturing extension programs at the National Institute of Standards and Technology, cut NASA by one billion dollars, cut energy research by four billion dollars and freeze the National Science Foundation.

Mr. KASICH would cut funding for education and training programs by $4.4 billion over five years. In housing, the Republicans would freeze Section 8 funding leading to a cumulative $18.5 billion shortfall in funding for these contracts through 2003. Flood insurance contributions would be cut by $1.7 billion leading to higher premiums for those living in flood plains and FHA would be cut by $2.2 billion over five years.

The Kasich plan not only fails to provide for Transportation spending increases this House just endorsed in the Transportation Equity Act, but actually cuts budget authority for these programs by $23.3 billion compared to the 1997 budget agreement. The image of this House embracing a massive transportation increase before the recess, with Members rushing home to brag about their pork, and then repudiating that policy by voting for this budget when we come back from recess reinforces the old adage that a week is a long time in politics. It makes me wonder if there shouldn't be a media warning for C–SPAN viewers that they could suffer whiplash from watching this body too closely.

We have been told that the reaction to Mr. KASICH's plan was so negative in his own party that it has been withdrawn. Now, instead of a plan of savings, the House is offered a lame line about giving Appropriators and Authorizers the freedom to find the savings on their own. Our Appropriations Chairman apparently took the Budget Committee at its word about having freedom. He has already issued his 302b guidance to subcommittees based on last year's budget agreement rather than the Kasich proposal. I guess we know what the Appropriators think of the viability of this budget. Perhaps their view was shaped in part by the public comments of the Chairman of the Budget Committee in the other body, a self-described friend of Mr. KASICH, who has generously described the House Republican proposal as a ''mockery.''

The Appropriations know what the rest of us know: this budget is an irresponsible package that supporters try to make palatable by coyly repeating that they are simply asking for a cut of one cent on every dollar of federal spending. Mr. KASICH and his friends are not such doe-eyed innocents as all that. They know that 70% of Federal spending is off the table when it comes to talk of cuts. That means the $100 billion necessary to reach the tax cut goal will have to be concentrated in just a handful of programs and those programs have been the target of cut after cut during the last ten years. There is a consensus, represented by last year's budget agreement, that investment programs such as education, transportation and research cannot bear further deep cuts. If there were the votes to do that, Mr. KASICH wouldn't have been beaten into withdrawing his plan. But he was and he has and for good reason. Instead of a plan, we have a dust storm of platitudes. Well, platitudes won't cover the tab for $100 billion in tax cuts.

Over the years there has been a lot of talk, especially from the other side of the aisle, about truth in budgeting. If truth in budgeting is more than a slogan, this House should unite in a bipartisan rejection of the Budget Committee proposal. Defeat the Kasich budget, embrace the Spratt alternative and give this House a shred of credibility as we embark upon the appropriations process and enter into budget conference with the Senate.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H. Con. Res. 284, the fiscal year 1999 budget resolution. Last summer, the Congress and the President worked together to reach agreement on a balanced budget for the first time in 30 years. This resolution breaks that agreement. I cannot support this resolution, House Democrats will not support this resolution, and the President will not support this resolution. Even the Republican Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee said this resolution is a ''mockery.''

Ths resolution includes drastic cuts in non-defense discretionary spending. Even more outrageous than the magnitude of these cuts is the fact that the resolution does not specify which programs will be cut or by how much. However, the list of suggested cuts distributed by the Budget Committee clearly reveals the intentions of the Republican leadership.

The cuts are so broad and so sweeping that almost every American would feel the impact of this budget resolution. This budget resolution will gut environmental protections, law enforcement, low income housing, and health care for uninsured children. And it does nothing to protect Social Security. I'd like to list just a few examples of just how extreme this resolution really is. The budget resolution:

Eliminates Americorps;

Cuts the federal commitment to Mass Transit programs, which we just increased under the ISTEA reauthorization;

Freezes future spending on law enforcement, at the same time that Republicans argue that there is a lack of commitment to fight the war on drugs;

Ends the federal commitment under Title I which assists low-income areas meet their education needs;

Ends the work of the Legal Services Corporation;

Ends federal support of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting;

Ends federal land acquisition programs;

Reduces the Children's Health Insurance Program, which was part of last year's Balanced Budget Act, by 40 percent; and

Increases premiums for health insurance for all government employees.

Why are all these cuts necessary? Not to secure the future of Social Security. Not to protect the solvency of Medicare. Not to make the needed investment in our children's education. The cuts are ''needed'' so we can have another tax cut.

This is not a serious budget resolution. It is a empty political gesture and I urge my colleagues to reject it.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H. Con. Res. 284, the fiscal year 1999 Budget Resolution. This measure would have a chilling effect on mandatory and nondefense discretionary spending, and its proposed $101 billion tax cut is a poorly timed move as we enjoy a stronger economy and budget surplus resulting from last year's Balanced Budget Act.

Although I am strongly opposed to with H. Con. Res. 284, I want to make clear that I support efforts to address the inequities in our tax code caused by the so-called ''marriage penalty.'' I look forward to being in a position to support legislation that ends the current situation which requires some two-income married couples to pay more in taxes when filing jointly than they would pay if not married.

This is not that legislation.

H. Con. Res. 284 calls for $101 billion in spending cuts over five years. These reductions are separate and above those enacted in last year's budget agreement, with every dollar of these additional cuts coming from nondefense spending and all of the savings targeted for tax cuts. Of the spending cuts proposed $56 billion would be slashed from entitlement programs like Medicare and Medicaid and $45 billion from nondefense discretionary programs.

The $12 billion Medicaid cut will exacerbate the negative effects of last year's $10 billion cut in the program. The state of California is still struggling to provide health care to the poor and indigent, especially the many uninsured and Medicaid patients in Los Angeles County. These cuts could jeopardize the health service delivery reforms that the County has struggled to make under its current Medicaid waiver.

The resolution's Medicare cuts may also jeopardize the Health Care Financing Administration's (HCFA) ability to effectively administer the program, particularly since Medicare's administrative budget is already insufficient to meet the Agency's new responsibilities under the Balanced Budget Act.

With respect to the discretionary cuts, the proposed reductions include $290 million from important programs like the National Health Service Corps, the Agency for Health Care Policy and Research, and health professions' education. The GOP budget cuts $4.4 billion from crucial education programs like the Title I program for disadvantaged children, and recommends a voucher program which will only serve to undermine our public educational system.

The GOP budget resolution reneges on last year's budget agreement. While not perfect, the 1997 budget bill was the product of months of very difficult negotiations between the White House and congressional leaders. We must say no to these new cuts which will harm the most vulnerable of our citizens and threaten our current budget surplus by voting down the Kasich bill.

Mr. HILLEARY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this budget. However, although this budget makes no recommendation on the funding of the Tennessee Valley Authority's (TVA) non-power programs, I believe that this Congress should carefully review two important new government studies of these programs.

TVA's non-power functions cover dam safety, reservoir management, water quality, and natural resource management, recreation, commercial navigation, environmental cleanup and other programs. Last year, Congress appropriated $70 million along with the Appropriations Committee issuing report language claiming that TVA ratepayers should be expected to fund the non-power programs beginning in fiscal year 1999.

Recently, however, both the General Accounting Office (GAO) and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) have issued reports within the past month reviewing the nature of TVA's non-power programs. Both of these reports conclude that TVA is performing services that are clearly federal responsibilities.

In many cases, these are services currently performed by the Corps of Engineers elsewhere in the country and paid for out of the federal treasury.

It is simply not fair to the taxpayers of the Tennessee Valley region to ask them to pay for items that are clearly federal stewardship responsibilities in their own area through higher power rates, while at the same time taxing the people of the Tennessee Valley to pay for these same services that the federal government provides everywhere else in the country.

The OMB report concludes that ''In the Administration's view, the no-power programs that TVA now operates are essential for prudent stewardship of the resources TVA manages.'' The report further states that TVA programs continue to be important to the Tennessee Valley region and the country.''

It is my hope that in the interest of fairness and equity, this Congress will continue to appropriate funds for the federal stewardship responsibilities performed by TVA just as this Congress accepts and appropriates funds for these same responsibilities elsewhere in the United States.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this budget which will move this nation in the right direction. It provides important tax relief for my constituents, including eliminating the marriage penalty which makes married couples pay higher taxes just because they are married. The marriage penalty is morally wrong and I am pleased that we are moving forward to eliminate this unfair tax.

This budget provides tax relief while funding programs that are very important to the 15th District of Florida. In particular, I am pleased that the budget provides stable funding for NASA, by funding NASA at least as high as the president's budget. On page 164 of the budget, it states that the budget, ''Assumes the administration's funding levels for NASA.'' This will guarantee stable funding for the Space Shuttle, Space Station and other critical NASA programs important to my constituents who work at Kennedy Space Center (KCS). I thank the Chairman for hearing my request on behalf of my constituents and responding positively.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I, like most Members of the House, strongly oppose the Republican Leadership's budget, because it betrays the values of working American families on several fronts. We have heard of the painful cuts to seniors' and children's programs. But just as devastating are the cuts in environmental protection, in particular the cleanup of our nation's 1,300 toxic waste sites—known as Superfund sites.

As a representative from New Jersey, which has 117 of these 1,300 sites—more than any other state, I am offended by this blatant disregard for the health and safety of those families that are forced to live every day with the threat of a Superfund site in their midst.

One in every four Americans, including 10 million children below the age of 12, now live within 4 miles of a Superfund site. These sites can pose serious health and environmental risks to surrounding communities—and particularly children. Fifty percent of the Superfund sites assessed by the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry in fiscal years 1993 through 1996 were classified as definite public health hazards, and another 30 percent were of indeterminate hazard.

Already this year, cleanup work at up to 171 of these Superfund sites around the country has been delayed due to the Republicans' refusal to provide the funding necessary to expedite cleanups. This includes cleanups at sites in 44 of the 50 states—and three sites in my district alone.

And now with the Kasich budget and its $5 billion cut in environmental spending, the Republicans are asking 1 in every 4 Americans to hold on—and live with that nearby Superfund site just a little bit longer. The Republicans are telling 1 in every 4 Americans, including 10 million American children, that cleaning up these toxic sites is simply a luxury we can't afford, something that the federal budget simply does not have room for.

Democrats want to speed up the cleanups of these public health threats. We want to fund the Superfund program at a level at which two-thirds of all toxic waste sites in the country will be cleaned up by the year 2001.

I urge my colleagues, on behalf of 1 in every 4 Americans, to vote for a healthy environment for our children and against the Republican Leadership's budget.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, this week, the House considers the Republican Leadership's Budget Resolution for FY '99 (H. Con. Res. 284). The Budget Committee approved a resolution on May 20, 1998 by a margin of 22–16 with every Democratic Member opposing the measure.

While I could not have come to this floor to support the Committee-passed resolution, what is before the House today is even worse than the product that the Republicans voted out of Committee.

Today's Budget resolution is a cruel and direct attack on the least advantaged Americans. It shows the majority party's true colors.

They are willing to make our children pay the price for their politics in three significant ways:

The government infrastructure that benefits the common good and each individual family—our schools, our environment, our park systems, our crime fighting programs—is cut to the bone.

Programs providing a safety net for the neediest families with children are gutted. A $10 billion cut in the Budget category 600 translates into a 25% cut in budget authority for Temporary Assistance for Needy Families.

The proposal to spend $100 billion today on tax breaks for the wealthy to please voters at November's polls instead of investing it for Medicare and Social Security solvency will only devastate our future federal budgets—and our children will pay the price.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle say that it is not the role of government to help the downtrodden, the disabled, the children who happened to be born into families without means.

But is it the role of government to hurt them? That's just what this resolution would do.

This budget must be viewed in the context of the economy. We know that this era of prosperity has passed many Americans by. Although we have had a long period of economic recovery, our economy has not been that robust until the last year or two. In fact, during the first three years of the recovery (1991 to 1993), 80% of Americans experienced declines in income.

As the economy grew more robust during the Clinton administration, workers experienced some income gains but, in spite of these more recent gains, the gap between the rich and the poor continues to widen. Improvements in wages were just not enough to erase 20 years of falling and stagnating wages.

Census Bureau data analyzed by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities dramatically demonstrates this growing income inequality in 48 out of 50 states:

Between the late 1970s and the mid-1990s, the incomes of upper-income families with children increased in every state. On average, incomes of the richest fifth of families increased by 30%, or nearly $27,000, after adjusting for inflation. In sharp contrast, incomes of the poorest families with children decreased in 44 states in this period. The decline in the real incomes of the poorest families with children averaged 21 percent, or $2,500.

In the U.S. as a whole, Census data shows that the poorest 20% of families with children had an average family income of $9,250 in the mid-1990s, while the average income of families in the top 20% of income distribution was $117,500, or 13 times as large.

The income gap is not just between rich and poor. The gap has also increased between middle class and high income families between the late 1970s and the mid-1990s. By the mid-1990s, there were 40 states where the gap between the highest income 20 percent of families and the middle 20 percent of families with children was larger than it had been for any state during the 1970s.

This data is clear: economic prosperity has not been broadly shared in America. The poverty rate for children has not declined. More than one in five children lives in poverty. Although children represent one-fourth of the population, they comprise nearly 40% of the people living in poverty.

Nor has the pain of budget choices been broadly shared. Under this Budget plan, the young and the poor bear the pain, and the rich share the gain.

The Leadership's Budget cuts domestic spending by $101 billion over the next five years—a 19% reduction below the amount needed to keep up with inflation by the year 2003.

This is a huge cut below the already tight spending levels approved in last year's budget agreement. And, since the Republican budget does not include funding for the highway bill, the actual cuts would be even deeper.

More than 40% of the cuts fall on low-income families, even though these programs make up only 23% of all mandatory spending.

The Republican budget cuts Medicaid and children's health by $12 billion, and cuts education by $5.7 billion over five years.

The most insidious cut of all is the cut in the budget category 600. This category includes the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program (TANF).

The TANF block grant replaced AFDC, the JOBS program, and Emergency Assistance.

Cutting TANF reduces the funds states have to spend on providing basic supports for children. It also reduces state funds to pay for caseworkers to assist families making the transition from welfare to work. It reduces the funds to assure needy families with children obtain the education, training and employment assistance they need to help them become self-sufficient and avoid long-term welfare dependence.

If the TANF block grant budget authority is cut from $16.4 billion to $12.4 billion each year to achieve $2 billion in outlay savings, as CBO estimates, and all the cuts came from TANF assistance: Benefits for all TANF families could be reduced by about 25% which would require the ''average'' welfare family of 3 to live on about $275 a month; benefits for about one-quarter of TANF families could be eliminated ending assistance for approximately 1.5 million children; and basic education and job skills training needed for parents to become employable could be reduced or eliminated for up to 2.9 million parents trying to get back to work.

States would have $10.2 billion less over 5 years to make the promote job preparation to get families off of public assistance, to prevent and reduce the incidence of out-of-wedlock pregnancies, and to provide child care for needy children.

In spite of our budget surplus and beyond our targets agreed to in the Balanced Budget Act, this resolution cuts to the quick every way our government works to make life better for Americans.

Why? So we can give $100 billion in tax cuts and still have a balanced budget?

The Chairman of Ways and Means has floated various tax cuts but they all disproportionately help the upper bracket folks: estate tax relief, deeper capital gains cuts, exclusions for interest and dividends, reductions in the alternative minimum tax and marriage penalty relief. Even the accelerated deductions for health insurance provide more relief for those in the upper brackets than for taxpayers with lower wages.

The tax cuts are unfair and unwise when we know we must address solvency issues in both Medicare and Social Security.

In keeping with our vote today on school prayer, I hope I can reach the hearts and minds of my colleagues with a story about Moses.

About 3000 years ago, Moses interpreted the Pharaoh's dream of 7 fat cattle and 7 starving cattle as a prediction that Egypt would have 7 years of feast, and then 7 years of famine. Like a wise ruler, the Pharaoh saved some of the surplus of the 7 good years, so that the people of Egypt could survive the 7 years of famine.

That was a pretty big gamble the Pharaoh took, relying on someone else's interpretation of a dream.

He could have made everyone happy for 7 years and seen his approval ratings reach deity levels. He could have abolished the tax code and built and built a few extra pyramids for his best friends. Instead of the 3 pyramids of Egypt, he could have had 4 or 5. He could have built a dozen sphinxes.

But no, he was wise, and saved for a possible disaster—and the disaster came.

We don't need Moses to analyze the demographics in America.

We know that our current surpluses are temporary and will turn to deficits. We know that Medicare and Social Security will either have to be cut or taxes raised in the next 10 years. We also know that we can make the problem infinitely easier to solve if we save today's surpluses for tomorrow's shortfalls.

God doesn't have to give us a dream for us to figure out the right policy here.

If we don't pass a budget that saves for future needs, our children will wonder if we were so dumb that we could not to see the obvious coming—or just too foolish not to prepare for it.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this budget that guts safety net programs for our children so that it can give tax breaks to the wealthy. I urge my colleagues to reject it as well.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, this budget resolution is an outrage. If it were not for the seriousness of the subject, this proposal would be laughable. Surely no responsible legislator on either side of the aisle can vote for this resolution.

Let's look at just one of the worst things this budget proposes to do: destroy the Medicaid program and cripple the child health program written with such fanfare only last year.

This budget slashes those programs by $12 billion dollars over the next five years. That's actually $2 billion more than the Balanced Budget Act took from Medicaid. And every one of the Members in this House—certainly every one on the Commerce Committee—remembers how difficult and painful those cuts were.

Now this budget says let's do it again.

How do they think that can be accomplished? Well, the May 12 document suggested block granting the acute care part of the program; that's the code word for taking away the entitlement to services that elderly and disabled people, pregnant women and kids, rely on to get decent medical care and nursing home services.

And nobody should be fooled into thinking the long term care part of the program would be spared. The actual budget proposal takes more than twice as much money out of Medicaid as the May 12 document assumed—so it is obvious that all the protections in all parts of the program—including nursing home care—are on the chopping block.

Some people must have some pretty short memories around here. Maybe they've forgotten that when you do this to Medicaid, you are saying to widows that there's no Federal protections to keep spouses from being impoverished when their husband or wife goes into a nursing home. That you are saying to people in nursing homes that the Federal Government washes its hands of any responsibility for decent quality, staffing and services in nursing homes.

Maybe they've forgotten that it means saying to low-income Medicare beneficiaries that they won't be able to rely on help from Medicaid for services like prescription drugs or help with their cost sharing and premiums. Why the May 12 document says specifically that it would ''grant Governors the flexibility to determine how best to address provisions for beneficiaries with overlapping benefits.'' That's shorthand for saying there's no more Federal guarantee that poor Medicare beneficiaries will get any extra help.

Or should we assume that Mr. KASICH and his majority at the Budget Committee think States will just cut services for kids instead?

Is that the policy they want us to endorse?

Let's see, what else could they have in mind. Do they mean to slash the DSH program so there's nothing left? Or just let people be pushed in managed care plans with a totally inadequate capitation rate? That's certainly an effective way to undermine any quality care in those settings.

All this is made more outrageous because we already slashed this program last year. We've already seen such a dramatic slowing of the growth in the numbers of people covered by Medicaid that it's virtually flat.

We've got a surplus, for heaven sakes. But the philosophy behind this budget seems to be, well let's cut taxes anyway, and let poor people bear the brunt of paying for it. Because in this budget, it's programs for poor people that take the massively disproportionate share of the cuts.

This is idiocy. It's mean spirited, it's indefensible. If you vote for this budget, you might as well just say flat out to poor widows and poor kids in your district and all over the country—forget any guarantee of decent medical care. Forget any protections in Medicaid.

There's lots of other reasons to vote against this budget. But what it does to Medicaid is reason enough. Vote no.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the GOP Budget Resolution reported out of the Rules Committee. In this Resolution the GOP Majority has turned its back on the commitment and coherent budget agreement Congress crafted last year. The GOP reneges and risks our recent success toward balancing the budget and maintaining investment in areas of critical need to our nation and people. Instead, the GOP Majority has opted to put forth a measure which will force massive cuts in areas important to our nation's future such as health care, child care, education and the environment. This is not governing. This Republican budget clearly demonstrates irresponsibility, abandons the promise to save Social Security first, kills important investments in our children's future and clearly neglects the American people.

The Majority Budget Resolution will cut an additional $101 billion below last year's budget agreement in people's programs. Although the Republican rhetoric attempts to characterize such cuts as simply being I cent out of every dollar over the next 5 years, the reality is much more alarming than their rhetoric would lead Americans to believe. It takes billions from people's programs, Medicaid, TANF, education, veterans medical benefits, crime fighting efforts and natural resources. Furthermore, the GOP Budget does not add up. At a time when our country is in its greatest period of economic growth, when the budget deficit is on the way to elimination due to the major work done by the Democratic Majority in Congress and President Clinton in 1993—without a single GOP vote—and a surplus of $40 billion is projected this year 1998, congress should be seizing this opportunity. We should offer a 1999 budget which invests in working families and provides the tools and resources that increase the ability of all people to thrive in our nation's booming economy and has a paramount focus on insuring Social Security and Medicare's long-term viability. Instead, we have a GOP budget that miserably fails this test and our country.

The proposals contained in this Budget Resolution continue the Republican's war against health care. Last year, congress set our Medicare reductions of $115 billion for five years. Initial provisions in this year's GOP Budget proposal sought more than $22 billion in yet new cuts to Medicare and Medicaid on top of what is already set out in law. The Republicans planed to use these new cuts to finance a tax cut for America's wealthiest taxpayers. Only after intense criticism from within their own party and Democrats, the GOP Leadership opted to drop the Medicare cuts, but not the cuts which savage Medicaid. And the new children's health care program. This change relays a negative message to the elderly and the low income families and the disabled who were promised and deserve quality health care.

The Republican Budget cuts $5 billion from natural resources and environmental protection programs. this is money that could be used for the Environmental Protection Agency, Superfund, our National Parks, National Forests and Wildlife Refuges, protecting endangered species and funding important environmental cleanup. Protecting the environment and preserving the earth's natural resources should be a top priority in congress. A close look at this budget leads to the conclusion that the GOP Majority is indifferent to its stewardship responsibilities to this nation and land.

Last year's Balanced Budget Agreement explicitly assumed full funding for all Section 8 Housing expiring contracts through 2002. However, this year's budget fails to maintain the number of households who currently receive assistance by refusing to allocate funding for existing Section 8 contracts as they expire. This simply is a broken promise. Failure to renew expiring contracts will not only reduce the number of assisted households, it could force currently assisted tenants to face sharp rent increases, displacement or eviction.

In response to the concerns of the growing number of people whose Section 8 housing contracts that are scheduled to expire, the Republicans included no outlays for that purpose in their Budget, virtually making the budget authority unusable. Furthermore, according to the Congressional Budget Office, a freeze in renewing Section 8 contracts would ultimately mean one million households would lose federal housing vouchers and certificates by 2003. Today, rental housing assistance provides Section 8 tenant-based and project-based programs to over 3 million households. Forty-six percent of this total are working class families with children and 32% are elderly. This will force needy persons into the streets and into homelessness.

In addition, the Republican plan slashes education programs by $5.7 billion over the next 5 years. It eliminates direct federal funding to school district by repealing Title I grants and suggests that such programs be made into some sort of vouchers. These grants are essential in providing supplementary education and related services in low-achieving children attending schools with relatively high concentrations of pupils from low-income families. These additional cuts deprive our elementary and secondary schools of much needed resources that could be used for more teachers in our classrooms and internet access for all schools.

Furthermore, the Republican budget freezes every program it does not cut, specifically veterans' medical care, law enforcement, Superfund and Head Start. This adds up to real cuts when even a lowered inflation rate will depreciate the level support provided in this Budget blueprint. The reality is that 40% of these cuts impact hard working, low-income families that deserve our help and encouragement not the shabby treatment accorded in this GOP budget blueprint.

Moreover, just last night the Republicans dropped a special provision allowing Congress to use the anticipated budget surpluses on a convoluted, untested proposal offered by the Speaker: ''private retirement accounts.'' Such accounts are a unilateral, premature, partisan maneuver that is intended to superimpose this idea in place of a bipartisan agreement to truly strengthen and save Social Security first.

Deciding now to use the surpluses for tax incentive private accounts before addressing Social Security's long-term problems would siphon off resources that will be needed to maintain the solvency of the Social Security Trust Fund. Budget surpluses should be reserved until a Social Security Commission, the President, and the Congress address the long-term requirements of Social Security. This represents just another step in the Republican agenda to eliminate the Social Security Insurance program and squander away the projected budget surplus upon half baked schemes. While abandoning the specifics it is still the intent of this budget to tax expend the dollars, so one bad idea may just be replaced with another and have a similar impact of disregarding the commitment to save Social Security first.

Overall, this budget fails to meet the needs of the American people. The Republicans are a majority in Congress; it is their responsibility to put forward a plan that can actually be implemented and to govern. Because the Republican plan cuts so deeply and unfairly, and because it deviates so markedly from last year's bipartisan budget agreement, it hopefully stands little chance of being implemented. Attempts to implement it will ensure confrontation with the GOP Senate, Presidential opposition and a strong no vote from most Democrats.

After forty five days late without a budget proposal, the nation has a right to expect the GOP Congress to step forward with a sound budget plan—a budget that is not just another political, partisan scheme loaded with the tax break promises for special interest groups, more punitive, punishing cuts on the working poor and undercutting retirement, health and education programs so vital to our constituents' and nation's future. It seems that this GOP led Congress would blow a free lunch after they were handed a working model crafted by the gutsy votes of 1993 Clinton/Democrat Congress. That proposal has changed the economic path from deficits as far as the eye can see to an economic path based upon sound economics and a surplus this year and hopefully in to the future.

Here we go again. After last year's tax breaks and budget deal the GOP majority reneges in the name of an election issue. The Republicans attempt to break the 1997 Budget agreement and attempt to make a virtue of tax breaks for the special interests and breaking faith with Social Security and Medicare. Make no mistake about it this will break the budget. This is the same old GOP tax break siren song that the band plays when the GOP is asked why the numbers didn't add up—Play it again, Sam!

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H. Con. Res. 284, the budget resolution offered by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee. I believe that this budget plan is seriously flawed.

Thr proposed budget resolution would cut $101 billion in federal programs over the next 5 years in order to finance a tax cut of comparable magnitude. I am concerned that spending cuts of such size—in the wake of the budget cuts of recent years—would have a powerful negative impact on my district that would not in any way be justified by the benefits that the proposed tax cut could provide. I am especially concerned about the impact that this level of program cuts would have on the most vulnerable members of our society—children, seniors, the sick, and the poor. Our top priority must be to—at least—maintain the existing federal safety net for those individuals who desperately need it.

Moreover, it is my understanding that while the report on the budget resolution recommends that some or all of the spending cuts be used to eliminate the marriage penalty, the bill does not do that, nor would it take $101 billion in savings to do so. While the Budget Committee report on H. Con. Res. 284 is rather vague, it seems likely that much of the savings from the $101 billion in proposed spending cuts would be used for the kinds of tax cuts for the rich that usually characterize Republican tax legislation. In fact, H. Con. Res. 284 would not actually eliminate the marriage penalty in the tax code. The report only urges the Ways and Means Committee to use the savings produced by the resolution to eliminate the marriage penalty. The Committee—and Congress—would in no way be bound to do so.

I want to make it completely clear that I support efforts to address the marriage penalty in the tax code—I am a cosponsor of legislation that would make just such a change—but that the proposed level of spending cuts are not necessary to address the marriage penalty.

Nor do I believe that we should pay for tax cuts for the rich by cutting important federal education programs, infrastructure programs, environmental protection programs, research programs, anti-poverty programs, and health care programs. Some of the cuts assumed by this budget resolution would harm the most needy members of our society and rapidly reduce the quality of life in many of our communities. Other assumed cuts—like those eliminating critical investments in federal research, education, and infrastructure programs—would in the long run prove to be counterproductive; such federal programs are necessary in order to maximize our nation's future economic growth. Moreover, many of the program cuts and eliminations assumed in this budget resolution have been considered and rejected repeatedly by Congress in previous years. If the Members consider the implications of this budget carefully, I am certain that a majority of them will reject it.

I have a number of other serious concerns about this budget resolution. It is back-loaded—all the painful cuts would take place in the out-years after the November elections. It would change the pay-as-you-go provisions of the Budget Act that have helped to impose the necessary fiscal discipline on Congress. And, finally, it contains none of the President's important initiatives on education, child care, health care, and the environment.

In short, this bill has a number of major flaws. The bill does too little to preserve Social Security. The spending cuts in this budget resolution are excessive and unwise. Many of the specific spending cuts that are assumed in the resolution have been rejected before. And, finally, while Congress should address the marriage penalty, it could do so without the level of spending and tax cuts proposed in this budget resolution. For these and the other reasons described above, I oppose this bill. I urge my colleagues to join me in defeating this unwise, irresponsible legislation.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, it is highly likely that there will be a budget surplus of no less than 50 billion dollars for the coming budget year. For the first time in many decades there will be a window of opportunity to make meaningful federal investments in education. Unfortunately, the federal share of the overall expenditures for education is merely seven percent at present. This budget surplus offers an opportunity to bolster our national security by increasing the pool of brainpower to operate our increasingly complex society. I propose that the new budget surplus be divided in accordance with clear national priorities. One fourth of the surplus should be set aside for social security; one fourth should be used to give tax relief to families earning less than 50,000 dollars a year; one fourth should be allocated for direct emergency funding for school construction; and one fourth should be invested in other education priorities such as smaller class sizes, education technology, books, equipment, etc. This represents a worthy budget deal which should immediately be placed on the table for discussion and debate. We need an open debate on the best use for the surplus. What American voters should fear is a closed door, smoke-filled room deal in October with only representatives of the Republican controlled Appropriations Committees (House and Senate) and the White House present. A multibillion dollar deal is going to be made. Let this deal be done in the sunshine. Let's do a deal for the children of America.

DO THE BUDGET DEAL NOW

Start acting real
Right now do a democratic deal
Do this magic surplus deal
Upfront right away
Chase infected cynics
Off the political highway
Make humane rules
Build safe schools
Start acting real
Right now do the deal
Sunshine is now okay
Act fast in the light of day
Invest it the people's way
Stop pushing the no touch lie
In four pieces cut the pie
Start acting real
Right now do the deal
Vote for children's justice fast
Make up for the stupid past
The budget is on even keel
Upfront right away
Do this magic surplus deal.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BOEHNER) having assumed the chair, Mr. NEY, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 284) revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 1998, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 1999, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003, pursuant to House Resolution 455, he reported the concurrent resolution back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the concurrent resolution, as amended.

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were— yeas 216, nays 204, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 210]

YEAS—216

Aderholt	Camp	Dunn
Archer	Canady	Ehlers
Armey	Cannon	Ehrlich
Bachus	Chabot	Emerson
Baker	Chambliss	English
Barr	Chenoweth	Ensign
Barrett (NE)	Christensen	Everett
Bartlett	Coble	Ewing
Barton	Coburn	Fawell
Bass	Collins	Foley
Bateman	Combest	Forbes
Bereuter	Condit	Fossella
Bilirakis	Cook	Fowler
Bliley	Cooksey	Fox
Blunt	Cox	Franks (NJ)
Boehlert	Crane	Frelinghuysen
Boehner	Crapo	Gallegly
Bonilla	Cubin	Gekas
Bono	Cunningham	Gibbons
Brady (TX)	Davis (VA)	Gilchrest
Bryant	Deal	Gillmor
Bunning	DeLay	Gilman
Burr	Diaz-Balart	Gingrich
Burton	Dickey	Goode
Buyer	Doolittle	Goodlatte
Callahan	Dreier	Goodling
Calvert	Duncan	Goss

Graham	Lucas	Salmon
Granger	Manzullo	Sanford
Greenwood	McCollum	Saxton
Gutknecht	McCrery	Scarborough
Hall (TX)	McHugh	Schaefer, Dan
Hansen	McInnis	Schaffer, Bob
Hastert	McIntosh	Sensenbrenner
Hastings (WA)	McKeon	Sessions
Hayworth	Metcalf	Shadegg
Herger	Mica	Shaw
Hill	Miller (FL)	Shays
Hilleary	Moran (KS)	Shimkus
Hobson	Myrick	Shuster
Hoekstra	Nethercutt	Skeen
Horn	Neumann	Smith (MI)
Hostettler	Ney	Smith (NJ)
Houghton	Northup	Smith (OR)
Hulshof	Norwood	Smith (TX)
Hunter	Nussle	Snowbarger
Hutchinson	Oxley	Solomon
Hyde	Packard	Spence
Inglis	Pappas	Stearns
Istook	Parker	Stump
Jenkins	Paxon	Sununu
Johnson, Sam	Pease	Talent
Jones	Peterson (PA)	Tauzin
Kasich	Petri	Taylor (NC)
Kelly	Pickering	Thomas
Kim	Pitts	Thornberry
King (NY)	Pombo	Thune
Kingston	Porter	Tiahrt
Klug	Portman	Upton
Knollenberg	Pryce (OH)	Walsh
Kolbe	Radanovich	Wamp
LaHood	Ramstad	Watkins
Largent	Redmond	Watts (OK)
Latham	Regula	Weldon (FL)
LaTourette	Riggs	Weldon (PA)
Lazio	Riley	Weller
Leach	Rogan	White
Lewis (CA)	Rogers	Whitfield
Lewis (KY)	Rohrabacher	Wicker
Linder	Roukema	Wolf
Livingston	Royce	Young (AK)
LoBiondo	Ryun	Young (FL)

NAYS—204

Abercrombie	Doyle	Lipinski
Ackerman	Edwards	Lofgren
Allen	Engel	Lowey
Andrews	Eshoo	Luther
Baesler	Etheridge	Maloney (CT)
Baldacci	Evans	Maloney (NY)
Barcia	Farr	Manton
Barrett (WI)	Fattah	Markey
Becerra	Fazio	Martinez
Bentsen	Filner	Mascara
Berman	Ford	Matsui
Berry	Frank (MA)	McCarthy (MO)
Bilbray	Frost	McCarthy (NY)
Bishop	Ganske	McDermott
Blagojevich	Gejdenson	McGovern
Blumenauer	Gephardt	McHale
Bonior	Gordon	McIntyre
Borski	Green	McKinney
Boswell	Gutierrez	McNulty
Boucher	Hall (OH)	Meehan
Boyd	Hamilton	Meek (FL)
Brady (PA)	Harman	Meeks (NY)
Brown (CA)	Hastings (FL)	Menendez
Brown (FL)	Hefley	Millender-McDonald
Brown (OH)	Hefner	
Campbell	Hilliard	Miller (CA)
Capps	Hinchey	Minge
Cardin	Hinojosa	Mink
Carson	Holden	Moakley
Castle	Hooley	Moran (VA)
Clay	Hoyer	Morella
Clayton	Jackson (IL)	Murtha
Clement	Jackson-Lee (TX)	Nadler
Clyburn		Neal
Conyers	Jefferson	Oberstar
Costello	John	Obey
Coyne	Johnson (CT)	Olver
Cramer	Johnson (WI)	Ortiz
Cummings	Kanjorski	Owens
Danner	Kaptur	Pallone
Davis (FL)	Kennedy (RI)	Pascrell
Davis (IL)	Kennelly	Pastor
DeFazio	Kildee	Payne
DeGette	Kilpatrick	Pelosi
Delahunt	Kind (WI)	Peterson (MN)
DeLauro	Kleczka	Pickett
Deutsch	Klink	Pomeroy
Dicks	Kucinich	Poshard
Dingell	Lampson	Price (NC)
Dixon	Lantos	Quinn
Doggett	Lee	Rahall
Dooley	Levin	Rangel
Reyes	Skelton	Torres
Rivers	Slaughter	Towns
Rodriguez	Smith, Adam	Traficant
Roemer	Smith, Linda	Turner
Rothman	Snyder	Velazquez
Roybal-Allard	Spratt	Vento
Rush	Stabenow	Visclosky
Sanchez	Stark	Waters
Sanders	Stenholm	Watt (NC)
Sandlin	Stokes	Waxman
Sawyer	Strickland	Wexler
Schumer	Stupak	Weygand
Scott	Tauscher	Wise
Serrano	Taylor (MS)	Woolsey
Sherman	Thompson	Wynn
Sisisky	Thurman	Yates
Skaggs	Tierney	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Souder

NOT VOTING—13

Ballenger	LaFalce	Ros-Lehtinen
Furse	Lewis (GA)	Sabo
Gonzalez	McDade	Tanner
Johnson, E. B.	Mollohan	
Kennedy (MA)	Paul	

□ 1446

Mr. HILL changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, had I been present for rollcall vote 210, I would have voted "no."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the concurrent resolution just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOEHNER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, last night I was unavoidably absent and missed Rollcall Votes 203 and 204. Had I been present I would have voted yes on Rollcall Vote 203 and yes on Rollcall Vote 204, a conference report for a bill authorizing agricultural research and extension programs and restoring food stamps benefits to certain legal immigrants.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1054

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor from H.R. 1054.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request from the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. BONIOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask consent to speak out of order to inquire of the distinguished majority leader the schedule for today, the remainder of the week and next week.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the distinguished majority leader from Texas to give us a little information on where we are headed here, this weekend and next week.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that we have concluded legislative business for the week. The House will next meet on Tuesday, June 9, at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and at 2 o'clock p.m. for legislative business. On Tuesday we will consider a number of bills under suspension of the rules, a list of which will be distributed to Members' offices this afternoon. After suspensions, the House will take up H.R. 2709, the Iran Missile Proliferation Sanctions Act under a closed rule. Members should note that we do not expect any recorded votes before 5 o'clock p.m. on Tuesday, June 9.

On Wednesday, June 10, the House will meet at 9 o'clock a.m. and recess immediately for a joint meeting to receive the President of South Korea. Following the joint meeting on Wednesday and on Thursday, June 11, the House will consider the following legislation:

H.R. 3150, the Bankruptcy Reform Act of 1998 and H.R. 3494, the Child Protection Sexual Predator Punishment Act of 1998. Mr. Speaker, there is also a chance that we may consider H.R. 2888, the Inside Sales Act. The House will also continue consideration of H.R. 2183, the Bipartisan Campaign Integrity Act of 1997.

Mr. Speaker, we hope to conclude legislative business for the week on Thursday, June 11, and I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I would ask of my friend from Texas, and I thank him for his information for next week, and I would just note to the gentleman from Texas that also on the schedule for this week I noted that he had campaign finance on the schedule for next week. It was supposed to be on the schedule for this week, and of course we did not get to debate campaign finance. And in addition to that I note that the Committee on Rules has reported out the second rule making in order hundreds of nongermane amendments, and we are concerned on this side of the aisle that it appears that there is going to be or is in progress right now a filibuster by the majority on this piece of legislation.

And my question to my friend from Texas is are we going to do campaign finance next week?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for his inquiry, and if I may say to the gentleman, I too appreciate and share his disappointment about our having not gotten back to this subject this week, and let me assure the gentleman that it is my intention that we will be able to spend time on that, and it is my intention to move forward as expeditiously as we can. We had such a broad-based expression of interest on the part of so many Members with so many different points of view on this matter that the Committee on Rules did in fact act as inclusively as possible, and that clearly, as said, as the gentleman has identified, is a job that is going to take a great deal of floor time, and if I may assure the gentleman it is my commitment to get that floor time, make it available and to have this debate on an orderly continuing basis until we complete the work.

Mr. BONIOR. I would say to my friend from Texas, having served on the Committee on Rules for 14 years, that the gentleman from Michigan is well aware of how not to bring a bill up, and how to bring a bill up and never get to a bill, and how to bring a bill up and never get to the bill, and try and get to the bill and talk it to death. And it appears in this case that all three techniques are in play. I am very concerned that we may not reach a conclusion on this bill, and I want to assure my friend from Texas and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, those who are in fact not interested in this bill are getting and reaching a conclusion on this bill that we are going to do all that we can to make sure that the debate is orderly, timely, that we come to some closure on the bill, and we have been very disappointed so far this session in the progress or lack of on this legislation. It was not brought up, it was brought up under a procedure several months ago that I think most folks who follow this bill considered, and if my colleague will pardon the strong language, a sham, and now we are in a process of a very inclusive and open procedure, as my friend has mentioned, but one which will, in fact, if pursued to its ultimate, lead to no conclusion at all, and this again will not have happened.

So it is with great concern that I rise to express my concern and disapproval of how this has been handled so far, and I hope that we have an orderly, fair debate so all sides can be heard, that we can reach a conclusion and come to closure on the important questions surrounding the issue of campaign finance reform.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. I rise really in support of Mr. BONIOR's statement and would like to add to it that it has been indeed a very long time since that historic handshake of the Speaker in New Hampshire, where there was a promise to bring campaign finance reform before this body. Again we were promised that it would be brought before this body in May. We were told that it would be brought before this body in June. We are now in the second week of June, and it seems to be a continuing case of promises, promises, promises, yet never a reality.

And I would like to ask the gentleman, to underscore the question that Mr. Bonior asked, is this a new form of filibuster? Or are we going to have debate and a vote in this body, specifically where we have a vote before July 4th of this year so we can get it to the House, so it can get to the President's desk?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY).

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for continuing to yield, and I want to thank both the gentleman from Michigan and the gentlewoman from New York for this affirmation of commitment. It is not often I find myself with a shared sense of commitment with the gentleman from Michigan, the gentlewoman from New York.

Let me say it is my intense purpose to work with the legislative schedule in such a manner as to make all the time that I can find available for the purpose of carrying on this important debate, with ample notice for all parties at each point of resumption, to consistently and completely and comprehensively cover this subject, have all the votes and move it forward.

And I do not know how I can emphasize in more emphatic terms my conviction to get this done, and I appreciate so much the gentleman from Michigan and the gentlewoman from New York's willingness to work with me towards that end.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. I am greatly encouraged by the gentleman's comments in this regard and would just want to be sure I understood them correctly.

As you know, the Committee on Rules, in addition to any germane amendments that Members might have, has approved the consideration here on the floor by special rule of 259 nongermane or irrelevant amendments, which I think is more nongermane amendments than they have accrued on all of the bills that have been considered while the gentleman has been majority leader.

Is it the gentleman's intent then when we begin consideration of this bill next week to work through to the end rather than to start stop, start stop, start stop, as we have done today in an effort to kill the bill?

Mr. ARMEY. I appreciate the gentleman's observation of the sequencing of events. I am afraid I have to disagree with the gentleman's characterizations of the motive. Nevertheless, so many of those amendments that were offered, so many of the substitutes that were offered, come from the gentleman from Texas' side of the aisle, germane or nongermane. The Committee on Rules was very generous and accommodating to all Members of the Congress. We have before us a very large task, and I will and do have a high priority of returning to that work as frequently and for as extended periods of time as I can manage in coordination with the other legislative business before this body. It is a priority of mine, and I will emphasize that in every planning session I have, and I certainly appreciate again the willingness of the gentleman from Texas to work with me on this, and I am looking forward to everybody feeling confident that they were treated fairly under the rule, they were included, and they do have their opportunity to present their ideas and enter this debate.

□ 1500

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentleman very much. Does the gentleman believe then, as the gentlewoman from New York asked, that we can see this work completed before July 4?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield further, I would hope so. I cannot guarantee. As the gentleman from Texas knows, it is very difficult to guarantee anything in terms of a date certain time-line and so forth. But let me just say to the gentleman, if I can say it in perhaps the most colorful way that is allowable within the rules of discourse under debate, it is my intent to have this done, completed, thoroughly giving everybody their opportunity, and out of my life by July 4, if at all possible.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I would ask one other question to my friend. Does the gentleman expect late nights next week, and, if he does, will there be accommodations for the White House event that is scheduled for Thursday evening?

Mr. ARMEY. Again, I thank the gentleman. If the gentleman would yield further, we would try to hold it to no more than moderately late evenings, but the White House event of which you speak, of course, is something that we will accommodate to the maximum of our ability in the schedule.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ARMEY. Since the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) has the time, I wonder if the gentleman from Michigan would be willing to yield time to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP) for an announcement that I think of great interest to this body.

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to my friend the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP).

ANNOUNCEMENT OF DEATH OF BOB HOPE

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I have the sad responsibility to tell you this afternoon that Bob Hope has passed away. For those people in uniform, from the early days of World War II through the Gulf War, no man or woman in uniform ever had a better friend than Bob Hope.

Bob Hope always said he would never stop entertaining. He said that as long as he was able, ''I am not retiring until they carry me away,'' he said, ''and I will have a few routines on the way to the Big Dipper.''

We will all miss him very much. As you know, we honored him just recently. For the first time in the history of this country, we made an honorary veteran. That took place in the rotunda of the Capitol. We are all going to miss him.

Mr. BONIOR. I would add these comments to my friend from Arizona, that we are all saddened by his passing. He has provided so much joy and happiness to our planet, and to our servicemen and women in particular. He was a great American, a great world figure, and we thank him for the memories.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1766 AND H. CON. RES. 240

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor from H.R. 1766 and H. Con. Res. 240.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO PAGE CLASS OF 1998

(Mr. KOLBE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as we do traditionally on the last day that our pages are with us, to recognize them, to talk about the program and the contributions that they make to the House of Representatives and to all of us individually.

The gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER), the Chairman of the Page Board, wanted very much to have been here to do this herself, but she had to catch a plane from Baltimore and so has left us. But, Mr. Speaker, I will include at this point in the RECORD the remarks of the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER) and the list of all the pages who have served us this year.

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as Chairman of the House Page Board to give my heartfelt thank you to all of the wonderful and talented students who have been involved over the last year in the House's Page Program.

I know the hard work and, at times, late hours involved in being a page. But I can assure you that it is good practice as you embark college and eventually a career. This program is designed to give you a rich experience as to how our democratic government works. As you leave these marble buildings I hope that you will take with you a deeper understanding of what it means to be an American.

After spending so many hours here in this honored chamber, you must know that you have played a role in history. Your name may not be up on the voting display or your words may not be printed in the Congressional Record, but you helped to make what this Congress accomplished this year possible. You should feel proud of your achievement and I hope that your service here will inspire you to further success in life. We wish you the best of luck and thank you for your service to our country.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I will include for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the names of the pages that we salute today:

Joshua Allen, Dominic Alpuche, Chad Appel, Thom Backes, Sarah Beckett, Charlie Bond, Andrew Brehm, Brian Callanan, Keegan Callanan, Marianne Certain, Sarah Clark, Michael Conlon, Leia Cooper, Jason Dore, Richard Downe, Jamie Etherton, Robert Evans, Nathaniel Finn, Julie Fishman, Rebecca Fowler, Stephanie Ginebra, Brock Grunhurd, Lexi Harlow, Ashley Heher, Kristyn Hemingway, and Robin Hill.

Jill Hogue, Shyanne Hughes, Monique Jackson, Michelle Jenkins, Amanda King, Emilie Klein, Jacob Kosoff, Rodney Lake, Ryan Lane, Jennifer Lewis-Pike, Abbigail Look, Matthew McClellan, Danae McElroy, Jeremy Milne, Adam Morehouse, Anna Nichols, Jerry Paradise III, Janet Patton, Beth Pezik, Amy Phillips, Kevin Powell, Kristin Quinlan, Elizabeth Quinn, Abigail Racster, and Tracy Raeder.

Ambar Renova, Leslie Robertson, Glenn Schatz, Gina Schilmoeller, Erica Schmitt, Mike Shapiro, Kathleen Sherwin, Timothy Skidmore, Lauren Stafford, Brigit Swanson, Erin Vanderveldt, Meaghann Weniger, Adam Wiggins, Brian Woody, and Erik Yassenoff.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of Members who wish to speak on this, and I want to accommodate them all. I would like to begin with the other member of the Page Board who is with me today, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, about 15 years ago Tip O'Neill appointed me to the Page Board, and that appointment has been one of the most rewarding responsibilities I have had in the Congress of the United States.

We have had great pages in those years, in my 22 years in the Congress, very great pages, and this year's page group is among the very, very best I have known.

There is a program in this country called Close-Up, which is a very, very good program, but no one has seen the Congress as close up as have our pages. They have seen us at our best and at our worst; they have seen democracy in action; they have seen our national leaders; they have seen world leaders. They have enriched us, and I hope that they have been enriched by their experience here.

About a month ago they had an auction to raise some money, and among the things auctioned off was to have lunch with myself. I was the winner of that auction, because I had lunch today with Andy Brehm, Brian Callanan and Keegan Callanan, and I look at people like them, who are representative of all of the pages, and I really have hope for our future.

About sixty years ago Franklin Roosevelt spoke these words, which I think are as true today as they were then. He said, ''There is a strange cycle in human events. To some generations, much is given; of other generations, much is expected.''

This generation of Americans has a rendezvous with destiny, and, knowing you, I know that you will meet the challenges of that rendezvous. Thank you and God bless you.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and friend and fellow member of the Page Board for his remarks. He has been one of the stalwart individuals who has helped to make this page program work so well, and we thank him for his kind remarks.

There are few Members of this body that are better friends of the pages, few Members that take more time to stop by and say hello and thank them and do things for them and even take them on to his boat on the Potomac, than my good friend and colleague from California, DUKE CUNNINGHAM. I would like to yield to him at this time.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. You know, a critter is something that is usually cuddly. They know what a critter is. It is something that is underfoot all the time. Sometimes you swish it away, sometimes you pat it on the head for doing a good job, and critters do whatever critters do. So I aptly named this class ''the critters.''

We were fortunate enough to have a sunny day and we took 70 of these critters out on the Potomac. I want to tell you, I bought 20 pizzas, 12 bags of chips, 12 bags of pretzels, 15 cases of soda pop, two Price Club bags of nuts, and they were gone before we got to Mount Vernon. They are also hungry critters, as most kids are.

But we do not thank these kids enough. Sometimes they go about, they do their work. And if you have children and you want to talk about responsibility, when they left the boat, I said to a guy when I was up above driving the boat, I said, ''Is it clean down below?'' One of the critters looked at me and said, ''Duke, we are pages,'' like that is expected.

That is the way that they carry on their daily basis. They do not do it because they have to or that it is expected. It is because they are professionals, they are loving critters, and God bless every one of you. If any of us can ever be the wind in your sails, please give us a call. Thank you.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for his remarks. It is because of individuals like him that the program for the pages is more than just a job, it becomes a real life experience, where they get to know real people that work here in our Congress and our government, and I thank DUKE CUNNINGHAM for making that very possible for us.

I would like to yield to the gentleman from Virginia, who also is, like myself, a former page, and knows something about this program, though from a slightly earlier day.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it was many years ago. I remember my last day as a page. I was here for four years. In those days you could stay for the full time limit. I will add, in all these years on Capitol Hill, I have never been on DUKE CUNNINGHAM'S boat, so you are way ahead of me.

We have had a great outstanding group of young men and women who participated in the page program this last year, and I do not think everybody appreciates sometimes the dedication, the focus, the long, long hours and the flexibility that you have had to share, and hopefully the lessons that you have learned from that and the discipline that you have had to incur will stay with you and enable you to be successful in whatever you do.

But the average person sees you running around, doing errands on the floor, and does not recognize that you are getting up very early in the morning to attend school, and putting in a full day and sometimes a full night of work, and then going back to school the next day, and the rigors that it entails.

I know during this time you have witnessed some of the great debates, and some of the not-so-great debates, that go on here on a daily basis. I just hope you take the experience, the knowledge and the history that you have been part of with you, to be able to share it with others. And maybe some of you will, like the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and myself, enter the public arena some day. But whatever you do, we hope you will be successful and hope to keep running into you throughout the years.

God bless all of you, and thank you for your efforts.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for his kind comments about our pages and for his service here as a page, as well as a Member of Congress. I am sure he has had an opportunity to explain to the pages that he was always perfect when he was here and never engaged in any kind of antics. I know that certainly was the case for myself when I was here.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to my friend and colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the former page from Arizona for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I was never a page, but I had the opportunity, as I have told page classes in the past, as President of the Maryland Senate, to run the page program in the Maryland Senate for four years. It was, like the page program we have here, an extraordinary, unique education for a very select group of young people, a group of young people who had an experience, as you have had, like a very, very, very small percentage of their age group have.

We talk about the future being up to you. The gentleman from Michigan (DALE KILDEE), who has done so much for the page program over the years, talked about Franklin Roosevelt's observation about some generations being given much, and some generations having much expected of them.

In my opinion, all generations through the ages of pages ought to have a lot expected of them, and we expect a lot of you. We expect a lot of you because you are outstanding members of your generation. Unlike some other outstanding members of your generation, you have had an experience that they will not have. You have had the opportunity to be present firsthand in the body that is looked to throughout the world by the billions of people who live on our planet as the center of democracy, as the center of a successful effort for people to come together and peacefully resolve differences.

During the course of your being a page here and your very outstanding service to not just us as individual Members of Congress but to this institution and to the people of America, you have had the opportunity to see some pretty animated debate. You have seen some of us get, I would say, angry at some times at one another. DUKE CUNNINGHAM has gotten angry from time to time, and I have gotten angry from time to time. But then you saw a DUKE CUNNINGHAM and a STENY HOYER come together as friends, honored by their neighbors in being elected to this House, knowing full well that we are all Americans, and though we are animated in debate, it is really that on which we agree that is most important. You have had that opportunity.

□ 1515

There is a lot of cynicism in America among some people about their Democratic institutions, and that is not helpful in a democracy. We need to have citizens have confidence in their democracy, in their institutions of government, and particularly in this House and the Senate just down the hall, because that is the way we resolve our differences and make progress as a democracy, a model for the world.

You, with your special knowledge, can educate your generation to the substance of what their democracy is all about as represented here in the people's House. I am always pleased.

I thank my friend, the gentleman from California, and my friend, the gentleman from Arizona, for allowing me to participate in this farewell. But it is not farewell. Obviously the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) is here, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) is here, and you may be here for years to come in various capacities.

But thank you. Thank you for taking the time to expend the effort to learn, to participate, to contribute to making this House and this country a better place. You are richer for it. We are richer for your service. I hope that you will go back to your respective communities and your families and your schools and talk to your friends, educate them further, and make our democracy better. Congratulations to all of you. Godspeed.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) who has had one more thought and has to catch a plane.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, as usual, I forget something, and I will be brief. But I would ask three things of you kids, critters.

First of all, when there is a page reunion, come back, and make it a positive thing to do that, whatever it takes, because you have made lasting friends. I think that is important.

Secondly, each and every one of you is going to go back home. You are used to going to Georgetown. You are used to going on the Metro. You are used to going down here to the little soup and salad place all together, all on your own.

The first time you go out the door, your mom and dad are going to say "Where are you going?" and you say "I am going out, mom and dad." They say "Not so fast." Break them in easy.

If I have ever seen a problem, it is with pages going back that have had their independence here and freedom, and all of a sudden going back home and to the reality of parenthood. Break in your parents easy.

The third thing is come see us in the offices. Call us and send us letters. God bless.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) very much.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to take a moment, I have delayed my departure back to my district, to congratulate each of our pages this afternoon.

I just wanted to say briefly that the pages have had a great experience and a rare opportunity, and it is very similar to what we have as Members of Congress, a tremendous experience being elected to represent our individual districts. It is a rare opportunity that very few individuals ever get to experience. So you, too, have had that privilege, that honor, and you have served us very well.

Sometimes the pages are taken for granted. They get here, and they hit the ground running, and they are called on immediately to perform. Right up to their last hour of service this afternoon, they have been called on and performed so well. Again, it is, though, an incredible and rare experience, and we are so proud of the way that this class has conducted itself.

I am a little bit of a history nut, as some of you know, and my interest in the Capitol and the history of this Chamber. Today, as you leave on June 4, you will be part of the history of an incredible body.

I think you have had the opportunity to see, too, what very few individuals ever get to see up close; and that is that, in fact, this government does work and, in fact, it is truly representative of this Nation. Just like each of you have come from different families and different districts and different backgrounds and different party affiliations, but you have come together and been a part of the history and this process. So it is a tremendous and unique opportunity.

As Daniel Webster said up there, if you look, he said that you perform when you come here. If you perform a service, it is something worthy to be remembered. Certainly your service has been in the same light as asked by one of our great Americans who served in Congress with such distinguished history. You have been, again, a tremendous credit to us.

I thank you personally, and I now extend the thanks of all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. We wish you Godspeed and the very best in your future careers. Thank you.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. I am very pleased to yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I thank him for assembling and having given me the opportunity for me to join in words of appreciation.

First, I am appreciative of the fact that you wanted to come; that you were talented enough to be selected for this unique opportunity. Not only were you talented or willing to come, but you so ably and so joyfully served in your capacity.

You did a variety of things. I know some of them were less exciting. Never did we see it on your face. Always with a sense of expectancy, always with a sense of your purpose. Your presence suggested that you had all the confidence.

I feel, as you go forth, that you bring us hope. Those of us who serve in Congress, sometimes we become a little cynical because we are not quite sure if what we do and all of the discussions we have are making that much sense. In fact, sometimes we know we are not making sense.

But one of the things we feel is that, of all the things we do, if we can give hope to young people, young people can share part of their life and inspire us to be all the things that we can be for this country, we know this country has embraced that.

So I thank you for being with us, but thank you for who you are and, more importantly, I thank you for what I think you will become.

All of you are very special, but one of you comes from my district. So, Monique Jackson, I expect great things. You one day may be in here in Congress yourself. So thank you very much.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her kind comments and good words.

Mr. Speaker, if I might ask my colleagues and the pages to indulge me for just 1 minute for a couple of comments of my own as we close here.

Mr. Speaker, let me also add my words of thanks to the pages for the service that they have given us. This is a program that goes back a long ways, almost 200 years ago, when an individual was appointed to serve as a runner here in the Congress.

Through the years, the program has sputtered on and off, but it has generally been with us. It has kind of been more formalized in this century. Of course, for the last 20 years it has been a much more organized and formal program.

But even though the program has changed dramatically through the years, when I was here as a page it was boys only, when I was here as a page it was 4 years of high school that you could be here for, the program has changed a lot but many things about it are still very much the same.

What is the same about it is the kind of good work you do for us, the kind of help you give us to make our lives just a little bit easier. It is like the grease on the wheel that just makes it turn a little bit easier. We sometimes take it for granted and forget about it, but you make our lives just better and easier for us.

I hope it is the same for you, that you take something back from this program, as I think you should and you will. I know for me there were many things I took back from it, good friends, and I know from the exchanges of phone numbers and addresses and, of course, now E-mail. We did not have that either when I was here as a page.

You are all going to be staying in touch and you will be coming back. But I have taken many good friends. Two of them are here on the floor of the House of Representatives that were in my class. Donn Anderson used to be the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and Ron Lasch, our majority person here on the floor, assistant on the floor, both of them were in my class. They have stayed and given an incredible amount of service to this body and to their country through the years.

You have an opportunity to do that as well. When I left here, people would ask me, ''What is it you really learned about politicians and Senators and Congressmen from your experience as a page?'' I thought about it, and I said, ''Well, you know, I guess the most important thing I learned is that they put their pants on one leg at a time like everyone else.'' We may laugh at that, but it is true.

You learn the very best and you learn the worst about politicians here. You see them at their very best. You see them at their very worst. That is true of any experience you are going to have in life where you are close up with people. You will see the human frailties, but you will also see the good things that will come out about people. I hope you will remember the good things, and you will use the good things to build on that.

This week I flew across this country of ours to attend the funeral of my sponsor, Barry Goldwater. He was a great mentor to me. I learned a lot from Barry Goldwater. But I think what I learned most was some very simple values that he gave of integrity, of honesty, of patriotism.

When you go away from this experience, I hope that above anything else that you get out of this, it will be some of those simple values that you can use in life no matter what you do.

Whether you return to the Congress as a Member, as a staff person, whether you serve in government as he served for so many years, there are values that go beyond any particular job. There are values of patriotism, of honor, of integrity. You have a great opportunity to make a lot from this.

We wish you Godspeed and we look forward to seeing each and every one of you come back. I thank each and every one of you.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY, JUNE 9, 1998

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, June 9, 1998, for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 1998

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Tuesday, June 9, 1998, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. on Wednesday, June 10.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 1998, FOR THE PURPOSE OF RECEIVING IN JOINT MEETING HIS EXCELLENCY KIM DAE-JUNG, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Wednesday, June 10, 1998, for the Speaker to declare a recess, subject to the call of the Chair, for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting his excellency Kim Dae-Jung, President of the Republic of Korea.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

☐ 1530

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The Chair will now entertain one-minute requests.

TRIBUTE TO BILL POWELL, A MIDDLE GEORGIA LEGEND

(Mr. CHAMBLISS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a middle Georgia legend, Bill Powell, who will close out 40-plus years of service during tonight's 6:00 newscast on WMAZ TV in Macon, Georgia.

Upon his arrival in Macon on WMAZ radio in 1958, Bill quickly became one of the community's most popular radio personalities, and it was only natural when Bill leaped into television weather at WMAZ in 1982 that he soon became one of central Georgia's best and most popular television personalities.

Bill has given of his time to speak to local schools and community organizations concerning various weather topics. He has served with distinction on a number of boards within central Georgia, such as the Museum of Aviation, the Middle Georgia Air Force Association, and the South Side Lions Club.

As Bill retires, he will take his sense of humor and fun-loving personality, but will leave a legacy of community service that will be difficult to surpass.

Congratulations, Bill, on a job well done. As you told your listeners for so many years, keep on keeping on. God bless you, Bill.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. LINDA SMITH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CONYERS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSION TO INVESTIGATE THE PROBLEM OF RISING PRESCRIPTION DRUG PRICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, recently I introduced legislation to create a commission that will report to the Congress on the problem of rising prescription drug prices. The commission will do much needed research into how we can change public policy to ensure the affordability of prescription drugs.

Prescription drugs are the highest out-of-pocket expenses for three out of four elderly patients. Recent price increases for generic pharmaceuticals have been as severe as 4,000 percent. One thousand tablets of Chlorapropamide, a medication that is necessary to sustain life for diabetics, has gone from $19.45 to $306.66 this year.

All other segments of the health care industry have contributed greatly to bringing down health care costs. Since 1980, the cost of pharmaceuticals have risen over 2½ times the rate of inflation. Everyone is affected by these increases through insurance costs, government reimbursements, not just the uninsured.

Considering the Federal Government's and taxpayers' rather large public investment in the pharmaceutical industry through the form of tax incentives, tax write-offs, and grants, some discipline in making responsible pricing decisions should be expected.

The industry had over $6 billion in annual deductions for promotional activity before the FDA recently decided to relax direct marketing restrictions. This commission will lay a foundation on which to build policy that keeps prescription drugs reasonably priced.

The commission will look into why American consumers are paying much more than those in other countries, why increases are out of line with inflation of other goods. It is time for the Congress to act responsibly and ensure that corporate greed does not get in the way of our seniors having affordable health care.

This legislation is fair and evenhanded, and something our senior citizens and the public deserve. I encourage Members to support this bill.

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the special order time of the gentleman from California (Mr. RIGGS).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

AMERICA'S RELATIONSHIP WITH MEXICO IN THE WAR AGAINST DRUGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I come before the House again this afternoon to talk about the subject of the problem of illegal narcotics, and in particular this afternoon, to address the problem relating to our relations with Mexico and Mexico's effort in our war on drugs.

As Members may recall, the Clinton administration certified Mexico recently as cooperating in our war on drugs. I really want to call to the House's attention the current situation with Mexico, which is reaching disastrous proportions. Just today there is information that our United States agents are warned of Mexican retaliation as a result of their participation in a sting operation in Mexico.

I have followed this effort of the United States to take action in Mexico in a money laundering and illegal narcotics operation within the confines of Mexico. I pulled up some of the headlines, which are quite revealing.

This one is the week of May 20. It says, ''Reno Lauds Mexico for Help with Probe. Customs Targeting Drug Money Bankers.''

In this sting operation the Attorney General said, ''Law enforcement officials in Mexico have promised to cooperate in a massive U.S. Customs Service money laundering investigation aimed at Mexico banks.''

Then we see another headline a few days later, ''Mexico Promises Probe of Bankers Indicted for Laundering.'' This is the headline on May 20; again, cooperation.

Then we find a sudden turn of events, that in fact Mexico is not cooperating. The headlines from the Washington Post on May 23 say ''Zedillo,'' the Mexican President, ''Blasts U.S. Undercover Drug Sting.'' He condemned the use of U.S. agents in that operation.

Then we saw an apology in another headline, ''Clinton Regrets Keeping Sting Secret.''

Then we find out that the sting was not secret, that in fact the Mexicans knew about it and were told about it in advance. The Wall Street Journal reports, ''Bank Bust Stings U.S.-Mexico Relations.''

The latest in today's newspaper, as I said when I began, is ''U.S. Agents Warned of Mexican Retaliation.''

Mr. Speaker, this is the country we certified as cooperating. This is the country that the Attorney General praised for cooperating in this sting.

This is what is reported in today's paper: ''The United States Drug Enforcement Administration has pulled its agents out of Tijuana, and the Justice Department is warning American lawmen on both sides of the 2,000-mile long Mexican border to protect themselves more than ever. The new threat they face is not violence from narcotics traffickers, but hostility from their law enforcement counterparts in the Mexican Federal judicial police.''

This is an incredible state of affairs. Here we have incredible amounts of drugs coming in from Mexico. Nearly 50 percent of all the hard drugs in the United States reaching our cities and our streets, our communities and our schools and our children, is coming in from Mexico, and a policy totally in disarray.

This is a matter that requires the investigation and oversight of this Congress, the attention of this administration, and should be investigated to its fullest, to find out what is really going on between the United States and Mexico in the war on drugs.

Are our agents now under attack? Are our agents going to be expelled? What is this administration doing about the country that we have helped, we have loaned money to, we have made a trading partner, and then now they are condemning us and not cooperating in this effort to bring corruption, to bring drug trafficking, to a halt on both sides of the border?

KOSOVA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, for the last several weeks the world has watched in horror as innocent civilians, men, women, and children, have been slaughtered in the province of Kosova in Europe. Forty thousand people are now fleeing their homes, are now refugees.

Kosova is a province of 2 million people, 90 percent of whom are ethnic Albanian, controlled totally and dominated by the Serbs, living under tremendous oppression. Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic uncorked ethnic cleansing in Bosnia, and here it is happening again in Kosova.

The people of Kosova, the Albanians, have no rights. They have no political rights, no civil rights, no economic rights. They are truly a people under oppression. Unemployment is 80 percent. They have tried for years peaceful resistance. It has not worked. Now their plight is worse than ever. The tens of thousands of Serb troops in Kosova have fired the opening shots, Mr. Speaker, in a renewed campaign of ethnic cleansing.

I have warned for years that Kosova was a powderkeg. Unless the U.S. and the international community intervene now to ward off a catastrophe, Milosevic will carry out there what he did in Bosnia, a horrific campaign of ethnic cleansing and genocide. Two hundred thousand people died in Bosnia. It could be worse in Kosova if we let it happen.

Thankfully, President Clinton reaffirmed last week during his meeting with Abraham Rugova, President of the Republic of Kosova, that the U.S. would not permit what happened in Bosnia to recur in Kosova. President Clinton was right.

But the time, Mr. Speaker, has come to put our money where our mouth is. The ethnic cleansing has begun. The burning of villages has begun. The expulsion of tens of thousands of ethnic Albanians has begun. The halting of humanitarian convoys has begun. All of this is how it started in Bosnia. The United States must now act.

In December, 1992, President Bush warned Serb strongman Milosevic that if he vastly increased the military repression in Kosova, the U.S. would respond in kind. This threat, known as the Christmas warning, formed the basis of U.S. foreign policy in the region. President Clinton reiterated the Christmas warning when he entered office. Time and time again State Department officials have noted that U.S. policy has not changed.

Today I say the Christmas warning has been triggered. To live up to our pledge to the people of Kosova and maintain our credibility in the region by meeting this solemnly pledged commitment, it is time we act.

Here is what we must do. We must strike with NATO air strikes. Today Serbian tanks and artillery are leveling villages, setting houses ablaze, and slaughtering innocent civilians. We should now utilize our assets in the region by destroying these weapons of war in the field and as they sit in their staging compounds.

We must declare a no-fly zone over Kosova. Serbian attack helicopters have been used against innocent civilians. This must stop. Furthermore, fighter aircraft have been moved into Kosova. American aircraft in the region must halt any of these flights.

We must reimpose the investment ban on Serbia. Milosevic's only access to hard currency has been through international investment. Unless serious progress is made to resolve the Kosova crisis, no additional international investment should be permitted. The outer wall of sanctions on Serbia ought to be maintained, and we ought to reimpose the inner wall of sanctions.

We ought to utilize the war crimes tribunal. Milosevic and his henchmen should be fully accountable for their actions in Kosova, and should be prosecuted for any war crimes they commit. We need to get international monitors back in Kosova. In July of 1993 Milosevic spelled OSCE monitors from Kosova. Now more than ever they must return so they can report to the world on the brutality now being committed, and to prevent further acts of atrocity from being committed.

On Wednesday, the Washington Post ran an editorial which I believe accurately captured the Kosova crisis, and what U.S. policy should be in response. The editorial said, ''Sanctions are in any case mostly beside the point. Only the credible threat of force and the use of force, if necessary, can deter Mr. Milosevic. The U.S. can intervene now, as it has said it would, or, as in Bosnia, it can be forced to intervene later, after much damage has been done and any solution is far more difficult.''

☐ 1545

Mr. Speaker, along with 25 of my colleagues, I am sending a letter to the President making these recommendations. Two months ago we requested a meeting with the President to discuss Kosova. Today we look forward to hearing from the White House when that meeting will be scheduled.

The genocide and ethnic cleansing in Kosova must stop and only we and NATO can stop it. The time for diplomatic niceties is over. We must act now.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following for the Record:

[From The Washington Post, June 3, 1998]

EMPTY THREATS

The Clinton administration has said time and again that it won't permit Serb leader Slobodan Milosevic to extend his brutal ethnic-cleansing tactics to the independence-minded province of Kosovo. Now Mr. Milosevic's troops are conducting precisely such atrocities in Kosovo, and the administration's response so far: more talk.

Kosovo is part of Serbia, which in turn is part of what's left of Yugoslavia. But only 10 percent of Kosovo's 2 million people are ethnic Serbs; 90 percent are ethnic Albanians. For a quarter of a century, the province enjoyed considerable autonomy, but Mr. Milosevic revoked that in 1989 to fuel his nationalist rise to power. Ever since, and under the lash of Serb repression, a Kosovo independence movement has gained strength. The movement has been largely nonviolent. But recently, as ethnic Albanians have become convinced that the West has abandoned them, an armed resistance has rapidly gained support.

U.S. policy on all this has been pretty clear—at least in words. The United States doesn't support Kosovo independence, but it does support legitimate aspirations for more autonomy. It favors peaceful dialogue and opposes armed conflict. President Bush warned in 1992 that the United States would use force if necessary to block ethnic cleansing in Kosovo. The Clinton administration embraced that warning in 1993. And as recently as three months ago, Secretary of State Madeleine Albright said the United States would not ''stand by and watch the Serbian authorities do in Kosovo what they can no longer get away with doing in Bosnia.''

But that's just what Serbian authorities are doing right now. In a wide swath of borderland along Albania, Serb police and soldiers have been destroying villages, killing civilians and turning thousands of men, women and children into refugees. An Austrian defense attache who spent two days touring the isolated region said, ''All the signs are that the Serbs are going on with ethnic cleansing in the Kosovo area.''

U.S. policy in the past three months has been a confusing mixture of sanctions threatened, imposed and withdrawn. Such sanctions are in any case mostly beside the point; only the credible threat of force, and the use of force if necessary, can deter Mr. Milosevic. The United States can intervene now, as it has said it would. Or, as in Bosnia, it can be forced to intervene later, after much damage has been done and any solution is far more difficult.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CHAMBLISS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ABERCROMBIE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE E-RATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, here in this Chamber we just finished bidding farewell to our pages, young men and women from around the country who had an opportunity to expand their horizons serving in our Nation's Capital, really being in touch literally around the world. And it is a marvelous experience that they have. We are all pleased that they were able to accommodate it.

But the fact is that we have it in our power today to extend that same rich experience, being connected around the world, to every young person in America, and through our library systems extend it to every American, and the magic of the Internet will provide that worldwide connection.

Today, I call upon the Federal Communications Commission to reject the calls we are hearing from some to delay funding the E-Rate program, to do the right thing by America's schoolchildren and library patrons by providing full funding for the E-Rate.

The Federal Communications Commission is within days of making a decision that can bring the power of the Internet to all of these constituencies. If some telecommunications companies have their way, unfortunately, the Commission would back down in the face of a last-minute campaign of threats and innuendo in an effort to discredit the E-Rate. As a result of this campaign, the full importance of the E-Rate and its potential impact on consumer phone rates really has failed to be heard.

Mr. Speaker, the E-Rate is not a new tax imposed by Congress on an unsuspecting populace. In fact, the E-Rate program was included in the Telecommunications Act of 1996, which was passed by a Republican Congress with overwhelming bipartisan support.

As part of that act, added by again a bipartisan initiative that included Senator ROCKEFELLER and Senator OLYMPIA SNOWE, it built upon the Universal Service Fund established in 1934 that was used to help provide access to poor and rural areas for telephone service to provide an extension of the E-Rate on the same basis.

The Telecommunications Act of 1996 extended universal service beyond residential customers to include our schools and libraries, and expanded that service available for universal service beyond simply the plain old telephone service and added access to the Internet. To suggest that this obligation is new seems ludicrous, since the telephone companies have been paying for universal service since 1934.

With these facts in hand, I cannot condone the action on the part of some companies who are adding customer surcharges of up to 5 percent and blaming the E-Rate for increased costs. The Telecommunications Act of 1996 contemplated full payment of the E-Rate by the other cost savings that would be passed on to the telecommunications industry. In fact, the latest research indicates that they have already received far more than the $2.4 billion that is contemplated.

In my community, Buckman Grade School was the third grade school in the world to have its own web site. It was able to do that by its cadre of dedicated parents with bake sales, spaghetti dinners, but access to the Internet should not be dependent upon bake sales.

We have 30,000 applications now pending from schools and libraries all over the country to give this Internet access. The E-Rate is good for business, it is good for United States global competitiveness, it is important for our central cities and our rural areas. Our schools and libraries are trying to educate tomorrow's leaders with decade-old technological tools far too often.

The E-Rate has a potential of putting all of our young people on the same par with the interns that we just celebrated. It must be supported. Our future depends upon it. I call upon all of my congressional colleagues to raise their voice to the FCC to make sure that the E-Rate is fully funded.

AMERICAN LEADERSHIP NECESSARY TO END SIEGE OF KOSOVA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton recently pledged to Dr. Ibrahim Rugova, President of the Republic of Kosova, that the U.S. would not allow another Bosnia to occur in Kosova. Sadly, another Bosnia has already begun.

Serbian strongman Slobodan Milosevic is now using the same ethnic cleansing tactics in Kosova that he used in Bosnia, which resulted in 200,000 deaths, 2 million homeless, and billions of dollars in damage to the infrastructure and economy of Bosnia.

The grim specter of Bosnia can now be seen in Kosova and along its border with Albania as tens of thousands of refugees are streaming across the border. Does that not sound all too familiar?

Refugees tell horror stories of villages that have been attacked by the Serbs and emptied of all Albanian residents. Innocent civilians have been massacred. At least 10 villages have been completely razed and thousands have been made homeless in this latest crackdown by the Milosevic regime.

These events of recent days were preceded by a massive series of Serbian offensives that have killed more than 200 people since the new wave of aggression began in late February. With further cruelty, Belgrade has restricted the supply of humanitarian assistance to defenseless men, women and children, much of it provided by the United States through Mercy Corps International and other international NGOs.

The Serbs have cut telephone lines to the region. They have set up roadblocks to seal off the area. They have prevented international journalists and human rights observers access to the villages. Milosevic is enforcing his own brand of Serbian apartheid on the 90 percent Albanian majority in Kosova.

Incredibly, this terrorism by the Serbs has occurred at the very moment President Rugova and strongman Milosevic have been engaged in weekly meetings arranged by Ambassador Holbrooke to negotiate a so-called peaceful settlement to the Kosova crisis.

Mr. Speaker, the killing in Kosova must stop. I have been to the region to see the situation for myself and I have met with President Rugova to hear firsthand a report on the current intolerable circumstances.

President Clinton must bring greater U.S. efforts to bring the massacre to a standstill as a first step toward resolving this bloody conflict that threatens to destabilize the entire region. The U.S., because of their indecisive leadership and weak demands, are seen as ineffective here even by our allies.

The Contact Group of nations has failed to impress Milosevic with the seriousness of its demands, which tragically have been stated without the muscle to back them up and consequently have been totally ignored.

Mr. Speaker, the only strong leadership that is going to come must come from the presidency. We must have U.S. leadership that will force the Milosevic regime to end its siege of Kosova and we must stop the killing now. Humanity cannot allow another Bosnia to occur in Kosova.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HORN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

A BROKEN BALANCED BUDGET DEAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer to the family of Bob Hope the sympathy of this House and my personal sympathy in recognition of all that he has done to contribute to this country and as well to contribute to the many veterans who have benefited from his service.

Let me also applaud the pages that will be leaving this House at this time and thank them so very much for all that they have contributed, and wish them very well and will add my request that they come back and visit us again.

Mr. Speaker, today we had an unfortunate experience in this House, and the experience was such that I thought it was appropriate to bring it to the attention of the American people.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY MAJORITY LEADER

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman from Texas yielding for a moment so that I may make an important announcement.

Mr. Speaker, earlier today I made an announcement that was erroneous regarding a report that Bob Hope had passed away. I want to apologize to Bob Hope, his family, and the entire Nation for the erroneous announcement made on the House floor today.

The floor announcement was based on a story which briefly appeared on an Associated Press Internet news page this afternoon. They have since removed the story.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I regret this announcement and I look forward to many more happy memories from a wonderful entertainer and a distinguished American.

Again, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, with that I will gleefully acknowledge that I do not have to offer sympathy to the family of Bob Hope and I am joyful about that.

I do want to provide this very important assessment of where we are today and where we are going. And I do that because as the final vote was cast on the Kasich Republican budget, I heard applause throughout this Chamber. And tragically, I think, those who are not engaged in this debate were misguided and misdirected.

Mr. Speaker, this is a sad day for America. It is the busting of a deal, the balanced budget deal that we made in 1997, when many of us from both sides of the aisle said that it is a good thing that we bring down the deficit, it is a good that we pay off the debt, it is a good thing we tighten our belts.

But for those who applauded, the reason why they may not be knowledgeable is because they will not feel the pain until the year 2003. The young people that we just congratulated as pages, senior citizens who will just become 62 or 65, veterans who have come to me in my office and said their whole health care package has been reordered because of the balanced budget, in the year 2003 they will really feel the pain.

For this budget that was passed today we have the words of the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget, these are his quotes, and I refer to Senator DOMENICI who said, ‘‘This budget is a mockery.’’ The Senate appropriations subcommittee chairman, Senator STEVENS, dismissed it and said, ‘‘I do not know where we are going to get $45 billion in cuts.’’

Mr. Speaker, this budget cuts veterans, food stamps, and title 20 another $10 billion. It cuts the help we give in foster care and child care that many of our States rely upon. This budget cuts Medicaid so that we force people into a system of no health care.

I wonder how many people realize that in the scheme of the number of systems of good health care in the world, that we in America, the United States of America, do not even fall in the top 10. The country that has the greatest ability of invention and research in medical care and health devices, we do not even serve our people as well as European nations and Third World nations, and yet we are going to cut Medicaid $12 billion.

☐ 1600

What does that do? I am not on Medicaid. It does not bother me, some may say. What it does do, it burdens your local public health systems. And for those of you who have HMOs who are squeezing you every day, you see how it feels when there are throngs of people forced into no health care. That is what happened today.

In addition, might I say that we have not fixed Social Security. We have cut food stamps, crop insurance, agricultural research that was already passed in a bill, just recently passed today, but we will be looking to try and fund those, and yet they have been cut $25 billion.

Some Members always say that it does not bother me, it does not impact me. But when the least of ours are not able to receive the services that they need, it does impact those of us who care. The balanced budget that we passed in 1997 took into consideration the great effort we have made to move people from welfare to work. But yet this budget we passed today imposes another $10 billion in temporary assistance to needy families. Might I say, it is families that we are talking about, men and women and children that we are cutting another $10 billion.

Oh, the economy is doing well, never been probably as active and as productive as we can see it today in 1998, but there are years to come. There are economic cycles. We have all been through them, the bust in California, the oil bust in Houston, the automobile bust in Michigan, the various cycles of problems that we have had. This is what you are going to face when people come in need to the Federal Government to help the States.

You will have in the year 2003 an enormous cut where services that are needed, Medicare and Medicaid and services dealing with welfare to work and transportation issues, the money will not be there. That is what was voted on today.

Lastly let me say, Mr. Speaker, we all talk about child care. In my community we have 5,000 slots for Head Start. We need 20,000. Yet this House has cut Head Start and it has cut job training.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply say that it would be a good day. It is Friday. But it is a tragic day. Those who applauded, I hope that sound rings in their ears as America cries out as this budget was passed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Members are reminded to refrain from individual references to Members of the other body.

E–RATE AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FORD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the FCC is on the verge of halting the collection of money for a new program to help wire schools and libraries to the internet thru the e-rate provisions of the universal service fund.

Let me begin with a few facts:

1. The Universal Service Fund is older than Social Security. Yes Mr. Speaker it is older than our most venerated entitlement program.

2. The 1996 Telecommunications Act extended the generations old Universal Service program to include schools and libraries. This is a matter of law.

3. Long distance phone rates are at their lowest point ever.

4. Access charge reductions to phone companies—part of the ‘‘deal’’ that resulted in the 1996 Telecom Act—have totalled 2.4 billion over the last 11 months—well above the $2 billion estimated demand for discounts in the Schools and Libraries Corporation.

5. The Schools & Libraries Corporations has 14 employees, smaller than the vast majority of Congressional staffs.

Now: through all the myths, propaganda, and nonsense that is being spread about the E-rate and Schools and Libraries Corporation—myths these facts are meant to dispel, one central fact is being neglected: Connecting schools and libraries to the Internet will benefit our children. It will benefit the children of my district and children across this nation.

That is why were are here: period.

I began with that simple proposition. Mr. Speaker, because we are getting bogged down in a debate that is becoming increasingly virulent, malicious, and frankly, political.

We are not debating the educational interests of our children, we are cowtowing to the selfish objectives of vocal interest groups.

But Mr. Speaker if politics is to stop at the schoolhouse door, then we ought to consider the needs of our students, the future taxpayers of America.

Mr. Speaker: Only 27% of classrooms currently have an internet connnection—in lower income areas, only 13%.

With this level of connectivity how can we expect our nation to meet our current and future labor force needs:

The Commerce Department reports that 200,000 to 400,000 jobs requiring computer software skills are currently going unfilled because of a worker shortage.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics recently predicted a 70% growth in computer and technology-related jobs by 2005.

From 1996 to 2005, more than 1.3 million new computer scientists, engineers, and systems analysts will be needed in the U.S. to fill vacant jobs. On average, this amounts to a need of more than 136,000 workers every year.

Just recently the Education & Workforce committee heard compelling testimony about this very subject. There is tremendous concern in communities across America that our schools may not have the tools needed to prepare students to work in an information intensive economy.

Still, the economy grows by leaps and bounds in large part because of the role of information technology on productivity.

In Tennessee, information technology has had a dramatic impact in the workplace: from transportation to medical services, information technology has created exciting new jobs opportunities for citizens across the state.

Over 400,000 Tennesseans are employed in high-tech industries.

The average wage for a high-tech worker in my state is estimated to be over $36,000 per year.

High tech exports from the state total over 2.1 billion dollars per year.

The growing importance of information technology to Tennessee and to the nation means that our students need the tools to compete and win in the 21st century.

In school districts around the state educators are working hard to provide students with the educational resources that they need.

The passage of the 1996 Telecommunications Act and the establishing of the Schools and Libraries Corporation provided a means from the Memphis city schools district to accelerate the implementation of the district wide Networking Solution.

When Networking Solutions was presented to the Memphis Board of Education the presentation culminated several years of research and planning to develop a network solution that would allow the District Technology Plan, Realizing Vision 2000 Through Technology to become a reality.

The plan would create a fast, reliable, and manageable environment that provides for an integrated solution for voice, data, and video. The scope of the Networking Solution project includes several major components: school workstation cabling and writing, school infrastructure, the district wide fiber networking service fees, the Administration Building server, and the Teaching and Learning Academy server.

Developed in concert with IBM, the district has implemented a network pilot project that gives the Memphis students and teachers a wide range of opportunities, such as: providing students with access virtual instructional libraries; the ability to transit and receive live, 2-way TV quality video, audio for Distance Learning, Video Conferencing, Video Broadcast, E-mail and Intranet Capability.

Memphis City Schools staff have worked closely with the Council of Great City Schools, the State Department of Education, and IBM to complete applications for the e-rate discounts in order to implement the Networking Solution district wide.

The first application was filed by the state on behalf of Memphis City Schools and other Tennessee districts as part of a statewide consortium.

Now under the e-rate plan, the average discount percentage for Memphis is 80%. 80% Mr. Speaker!! That figure alone indicates the degree of need that prevails in my district. That need is not only characterized by a technology deficit, but by a basic infrastructure deficit that borders on the criminal.

Just before the Memorial Day recess, two dozen public schools in my district were forced onto a half day schedule. Why? Because 24 schools in my district Mr. Speaker are without air conditioning!

Mr. Speaker we in Congress would never dream of conducting our business in anything other than first class comfort. We wouldn't dream of giving our staffs less than the most cutting edge technology to conduct ''the people's business''.

Yet we ask American children to learn in thrive in sweltering, crumbling school buildings. We pay no end of lip service to our commitment to the education of our children but we can't find one dome in a trillion dollar federal budget for school construction and infrastructure improvements!!

And now, to add insult to injury, we are having a serious conversation in the United States Congress—in the people's house—about depriving our children of yet another educational opportunity.

How long Mr. Speaker, before we act like adults in this body and behave in responsible fashion toward our children.

Mr. Speaker, I am the youngest member of Congress and perhaps a bit impatient. But I sincerely hope I don't have to spend my time in this body convincing my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to act like adults.

If we allow the positive benefits of the e-rate, schools and libraries corporation to be nullified because of malicious, malevolent, mean-spirited, selfish politics, then shame on the phone companies, shame on this house, and pity the American people.

Our performance on the Transportation bill before the recess bears witness to our enthusiasm for public works and believe me Mr. Speaker I have nothing against good roads.

However, while we are happy to pave over every available acre in order to improve our transportation system we remain unwilling to invest in our public schools—from the internet to air conditioners.

This Congress cares more about pavement than it does about people. The fact that we are forced to come to the floor on a Friday afternoon, when we should be at home at public school graduations, is clear evidence of that.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time we get our priorities in line or we will continue to see declining test scores and inadequate academic achievement.

Providing our students access to the tools of the 21st century should not be the subject of controversy—it should be the subject of enthusiastic engagement. So I encourage all my colleagues—ask yourselves this simple question: What is best for the children of your district. Will the e-rate get us there—in your hearts you known that this is true, now let's have the courage to act on that belief.

TREATY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE NAVAJO TRIBE OF INDIANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. REDMOND) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. REDMOND. Mr. Speaker, 1998 is the 130th anniversary of the treaty between the United States of America and the Navajo Nation. In tribute to the Navajo people and the great Nation of the United States, I am going to be presenting the treaty today in its entirety.

The treaty reads as follows:

Treaty between the United States of America and the Navajo tribe of Indians, concluded June 1, 1868; ratification advised July 25, 1868; proclaimed to the people of the United States and the people of the Navajo Nation, August 12, 1865.

Andrew Jackson, President of the United States of America, to all and singular to whom these presents shall come, greeting:

Whereas a treaty was made in and concluded at Fort Sumner in the territory of New Mexico on the first day of June in the year of our Lord 1868 by and between Lieutenant General W. T. Sherman and Samuel F. Tappan, commissioners, on the part of the United States and Barboncito, Armijo and other chiefs and headmen of the Navajo tribe of Indians, on the part of said Indians, and duly authorized thereto by them, which treaty is in the words and figures as following to wit:

Article I. From this day forward all war between the parties of this agreement shall cease forever. The Government of the United States desires peace, and its honor is hereby pledged to keep it. The Indians desire peace, and they now pledge their honor to keep it.

If bad men among the whites, or among other people subject to the authority of the United States shall commit any wrong upon the person or property of the Indians, the United States will, upon proof made to the agent and forwarded the Commissioner of Indian Affairs at Washington City, proceed at once to cause the offender to be arrested and punished according to the laws of the United States and also to reimburse the injured persons for the loss sustained.

If bad men among the Indians shall commit a wrong or depredation upon the person or property of any one, white, black or Indian, subject to the authority of the United States and at peace therewith, the Navajo Tribe agree that they will, upon proof made to their agent and on notice by him, deliver up the wrongdoer to the United States, to be tried and punished according to its laws; and in case they willfully refuse to do so, the person injured shall be reimbursed for his loss from the annuities or other monies due or to become due them under this treaty or any others that may be made with the United States. And the President may prescribe such rules and regulations for ascertaining damages under this article as in his judgment may be proper; but no such damage shall be adjusted and paid until examined and passed upon by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and no one sustaining loss while violating, or because of his violating, the provisions of this treaty or the laws of the United States, shall be reimbursed therefor.

Article II. The United States agrees that the following district of country to wit: bounded on the north by the 37th degree of north latitude, south by an east and west line passing through the site of old Fort Defiance in Canyon Bonito, east by the parallel of longitude which, if prolonged south, would pass through old Fort Lyon, or the Ojo-de-oso, Bear Spring, and west by a parallel of longitude of about 109 degrees 300 minutes west of Greenwich, provided it embraces the outlet of Canon-de-chilly, which canyon is to be all included in this reservation, shall be, and the same hereby, set apart for the use and occupation of the Navajo Tribe of Indians, and for such other friendly tribes or individual Indians as from time to time they may be willing, with the consent of the United States, to admit among them, and the United States agrees that no persons except those herein so authorized to do, and except such officers, soldiers, agents and employees of the Government, or the Indians, as may be authorized to enter upon Indian reservations in discharge of duties imposed by law, or the order of the President, shall ever be permitted to pass over, settle upon, or reside in, the territory described in this article.

Article III. The United States agrees to cause to be built at some point within said reservation where timber and water may be convenient the following buildings: a warehouse, not to cost exceeding $2500, agency buildings for the residents of the agent, not to cost exceeding $3000, and a carpenter shop and blacksmith shop, not to cost exceeding $1000 each, and a schoolhouse and a chapel, so soon as a sufficient number of children can be induced to attend school, which shall not cost to exceed $5,000.

Article IV. The United States agrees that the agent for the Navajo shall make his home in the agency building that he shall reside among them and shall keep an office open at all times for the purpose of prompt and diligent inquiry into such matters of complaint by or against the Indians as may be presented for investigation, as also for the faithful discharge of other duties enjoined by law. In all cases of depredation on person or property, he shall cause the evidence to be taken in writing and forwarded, together with his finding, to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, whose decision shall be binding upon the parties of this treaty.

Article V. If an individual belonging to or legally incorporated with it, being the head of a family, shall desire to commence farming, he shall be given the privilege to select, in the presence and with the assistance of the agent then in charge, a tract of land within said reservation, not exceeding 160 acres in extent, which tract, when so selected, certified and recorded in the land-book as herein described, shall cease to be held in common, but the same may be occupied and held in the exclusive possession of the person selecting it, and of his family so long as they may continue to cultivate it.

Any person over 18 years of age not being the head of a family may in like manner select, and cause to be certified to him or her for purposes of cultivation, a quantity of land not exceeding 80 acres in extent, and thereupon be entitled to the exclusive possession of the same as above described.

For each tract of land so selected, a certificate containing the description thereof and the name of the person selecting it, with a certificate endorsed thereon that the same has been recorded, shall be delivered to the party entitled to it by the agent, after the same shall have been recorded by him in a book to be kept in his office, subject to inspection, which said book shall be known as the Navajo land-book.

The President may at any time order a survey of the reservation and, when so surveyed, Congress shall provide for protecting the rights of said settlers in their improvements, and may fix the character of title held by each.

The United States may pass such laws on the subject of alienation and descent of property between the Indians and their descendants as may be thought proper.

Article VI. In order to ensure the civilization of the Indians entering into this treaty, the necessity of education is admitted, especially if such of them as may be settled on said agricultural parts of this reservation, and they therefore pledge themselves to compel their children, male and female, between the ages of 6 and 16 years, to attend school; and it is hereby made the duty of the agent for said Indians to see that this stipulation is strictly complied with; and the United States agrees that for every 30 children between said ages who can be induced or compelled to attend school, a house shall be provided and a teacher competent to teach the elementary branches of an English education shall be furnished who will reside among the said Indians and faithfully discharge his or her duties as a teacher, the provisions of this article to continue for not less than 10 years.

Article VII. When the head of a family shall have selected lands and received his certificate as above directed, the agent shall be satisfied that he intends in good faith to commence cultivating the soil for a living, he shall be entitled to receive seeds and agricultural implements for the first year, not exceeding in value $100, and for each succeeding year he shall continue to farm for a period of 2 years, he shall be entitled to receive seeds and implements to the value of $25.

Article VIII. In lieu of all sums of money or annuities or other annuities provided to be paid to the Indians herein named under any treaty or treaties heretofore made, the United States agrees to deliver at the agency house on the reservation herein named, on the first day of September of each year for ten years the following articles to wit:

Such articles of clothing, goods, or raw materials in lieu thereof, as the agent may make his estimate for, not exceeding in value $5 per Indian, each Indian being encouraged to manufacture their own clothing, blankets, et cetera; to be furnished with no article which they can manufacture themselves. And, in order that the Commissioner of Indian Affairs may be able to estimate properly for the articles herein named, it shall be the duty of the agent each year to forward to him a full and exact census of the Indians, on which the estimate from year to year can be based. And in addition to the articles herein named, the sum of $10 for each person entitled to the beneficial effects of this treaty shall be annually appropriated for a period of 10 years, for each person who engages in farming or mechanical pursuits, to be used by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in the purchase of such articles as from time to time the conditions and necessities of the Indians may indicate to be proper; and if within the 10 years at any time it shall appear that the amount of money needed for clothing, under the article, can be appropriated to better uses for the Indians named herein, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs may change the appropriation to other purposes, but in no event shall the amount of this appropriation be withdrawn or discontinued for the period named, provided they remain at peace. And the President shall annually detail an officer of the Army to be present and attest the delivery of all the goods herein named to the Indians, and he shall inspect and report on the quantity and quality of the goods and the manner of their delivery.

Article IX. In consideration of the advantages and benefits conferred by this treaty, and the many pledges of friendship by the United States, the tribes who are parties to this agreement hereby stipulate that they will relinquish all rights to occupy any territory outside their reservation, as herein defined, but retain the rights to hunt on any unoccupied lands contiguous to their reservation, so long as the said Indians, further expressly agree:

1st. That they will make no opposition to the construction of any railroad now being built or hereafter to be built across the continent.

2nd. That they will not interfere with the peaceful construction of any railroad not passing over their reservation as herein defined.

3rd. That they will not attack any persons at home or traveling, nor molest or disturb any wagon-trains, coaches, mules, or cattle belonging to the people of the United States, or to persons friendly therewith.

4th. That they will never capture or carry off from the settlements women or children.

5th. They will never kill or scalp white men, nor attempt to do them harm.

6th. They will not in future oppose the construction of railroads, wagonroads, mail stations, or other works of utility or necessity which may be ordered or permitted by the laws of the United States; but should such roads or other works be constructed on the lands of their reservation, the Government will pay the tribe whatever amount of damage may be assessed by three disinterested commissioners to be appointed by the President for that purpose, one of said commissioners to be a chief or head-man of the tribe.

7th. They will make no opposition to the military posts or roads now established, or that may be established, not in violation of treaties heretofore made or hereafter to be made with any of the Indian tribes.

Article X. No future treaty for the cession of any portion or part of the reservation herein described, which may be held in common, shall be of any validity or force against said Indians unless agreed to and executed by at least three-fourths of all adult male Indians occupying or interested in the same; and no cession by the tribe shall be understood or construed in such a manner as to deprive, without his consent, any individual member of the tribe of his rights to any tract of land selected by him as provided in article (5) of this treaty.

Article XI. The Navajos also hereby agree that at any time after the signing of these presents they will proceed in such manner as may be required of them by the agent, or by the officer charged with their removal, to the reservation herein provided for, the United States paying for their subsistence en route, and providing a reasonable amount of transportation for the sick and feeble.

Article XII. It is further agreed by and between the parties to this agreement that the sum of $150,000 appropriated or to be appropriated shall be disbursed as follows, subject to any condition provided in the law to wit:

1st. The actual cost of the removal of the tribe from the Bosque Redondo reservation to the reservation say $50,000.

2nd. The purchase of 15,000 sheep and goats at a cost not to exceed $30,000.

3rd. The purchase of 500 beef cattle and 1 million pounds of corn, to be collected and held at the military post nearest the reservation, subject to the order of the agent, for the relief of the needy during the coming winter.

4th. The balance, if any, of the appropriation to be invested for the maintenance of the Indian spending their removal, in such manner as the agent who is with them may determine.

5th. The removal of this tribe to be made under the supreme control and the direction of the military commander of the Territory of New Mexico, and when completed, the management of the Tribe to revert to the proper agent.

Article XIII. The tribe herein named, by their representatives, parties to this treaty, agree to make the reservation herein described their permanent home, and they will not as a tribe make any permanent settlement elsewhere, reserving the rights to hunt on the lands adjoining the said reservation formerly called theirs, subject to the modifications named in this treaty and the orders of the commander of the department in which said reservation may be for the time being; and it is further agreed and understood by the parties to this treaty, that if any Navajo Indian or Indians shall leave the reservation herein described to settle elsewhere, he or they forfeit all the rights, privileges, and annuities conferred by the terms of this treaty; and it is further agreed by the parties to this treaty, that they will do all they can to induce Indians now away from reservations set apart for the exclusive use and occupation of the Indians, leading a nomadic life, or engaged in war against the people of the United States, to abandon such a life and settle permanently in one of the territorial reservations set apart for the exclusive use and the occupation of the Indians.

In testimony of all which said parties have hereunto, on this the 1st day of June, 1868, at Fort Sumner, in the Territory of New Mexico, set their hands and seals.

Delgado, Inoetenito, Juan, Francisco, Guero, Herrero, Torivio, Narbano, Gugadore, Juan Martin, Desdendado, Cabason, Grande and Cabares Colorados.

☐ 1615

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for allowing me the time to read this historic treaty on its anniversary 130 years later. It is my concern that the government of the United States keep the intent of this treaty as it was originally signed by the Navajos to provide for those elements of education and for the preservation of their territorial lands.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Mr. TANNER (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today after 11:15 a.m. on account of personal business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ENGEL) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BERRY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ENGEL, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ABERCROMBIE, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. FORD, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MICA) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CHAMBLISS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, on June 9.
Mr. MICA, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. HORN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. KELLY, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ENGEL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SERRANO.
Mr. PASCRELL.
Mr. MCGOVERN.
Mr. ORTIZ.
Mr. CLEMENT.
Mr. SHERMAN.
Mr. MENENDEZ.
Mr. LANTOS.
Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
Mr. PAYNE.
Mr. HALL of Ohio.
Mr. BONIOR.
Mr. VISCLOSKY.
Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
Mr. REYES.
Mr. OBEY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MICA) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DICKEY.
Mr. GILMAN.
Mr. SMITH of Michigan.
Mr. FORBES.
Mrs. ROUKEMA.
Mr. HYDE.
Mr. THOMAS.
Mr. PORTMAN.
Mr. BOEHNER.
Mr. HOBSON.
Mrs. NORTHUP.
Mr. DELAY.
Mr. ROHRABACHER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. REDMOND) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ISTOOK.
Mr. BOYD.
Mr. ENGEL.
Mr. FORD.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS. from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 824. An act to redesignate the Federal building located at 717 Madison Place, NW., in the District of Columbia, as the ''Howard T. Markey National Courts Building.''

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. REDMOND. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, June 9, 1998, at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

9451. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Azoxystrobin; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP–300664; FRL–5793–6] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received June 2, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9452. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clopyralid; Extension of Tolerance for Emergency Exemptions [OPP–300657; FRL–5789–8] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received June 2, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9453. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Fenbuconazole; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP–300662; FRL 5791–5] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received June 2, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9454. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Polyvinyl Chloride; Tolerance Exemption [OPP–300656; FRL–5789–7] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received June 2, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9455. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to impose fees for certain programs of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

9456. A letter from the the Acting Comptroller General, the General Accounting Office, transmitting a review of the President's second special impoundment message for fiscal year 1998, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685; (H. Doc. No. 105—265); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

9457. A letter from the Administrator, Panama Canal Commission, transmitting a report entitled, ''FINANCIAL AUDIT: Panama Canal Commission's financial statements for fiscal year 1997,'' pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106(a); to the Committee on National Security.

9458. A letter from the Under Secretary for Acquisition and Technology, Department of

Defense, transmitting notification of a delay in the report on the allocation of core logistics activities among Department of Defense facilities and private sector facilities, pursuant to Public Law 105—85; to the Committee on National Security.

9459. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Waiver of Domestic Source Restricitions [DFARS Case 97–D321] received May 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on National Security.

9460. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the certification that the current Future Years Defense Program fully funds the support costs associated with the Family of Medium Tactical Wheeled Vehicles program; to the Committee on National Security.

9461. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Manufactured Home Construction and Safety Standards: Metal Roofing; Interpretative Bulletin I–2–98 [Docket No. FR–4271–N–01] (RIN : 2502–AH05) received May 18, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

9462. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Eighty-Fourth Annual Report of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System covering operations during calendar year 1997, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 247; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

9463. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Force Management Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department of Defense Education Activity (DoDEA) Accountability Report and the Accountability Profiles for the Department of Defense Dependents Schools, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 924; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

9464. A letter from the Commissioner, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Department of Education, transmitting the annual statistical report of the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES), ''The Condition of Education,'' pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1221e—1(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

9465. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the sixth Biennial Report of the Director of the National Institutes of Health, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 283; to the Committee on Commerce.

9466. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to reauthorize the U.S. Automotive Parts Advisory Committee through December 31, 2003; to the Committee on Commerce.

9467. A letter from the Director, Office of Rulemaking Coordination, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products: Test Procedure for Water Heaters [Docket No. EE-RM–94–230] (RIN: 1904–AA52) received May 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

9468. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; School Bus Pedestrian Safety Devices [Docket No. NHTSA–98–3870; Notice 7] (RIN: 2127–AG81) received June 4, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

9469. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Seat Belt Assembly Anchorages [Docket No. NHTSA–98–3773] (RIN: 2127–AF91) received June 4, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

9470. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Gasoline Volatility Requirements for the Pittsburgh-Beaver Valley Ozone Nonattainment Area [SIPTRAX No. PA110–4068a; FRL–6102–4] received June 2, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

9471. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans Tennessee: Approval of Revisions to the Knox County Portion of the Tennessee SIP Regarding Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) and Process Particulate Emissions [TN–184–1(9812)a; TN–199–1-(9813)a; FRL–6104–1] received June 2, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

9472. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plan; Texas; Revisions to 30 TAC Chapter 115 for Control of Volatile Organic Emissions from Perchloroethylene Dry Cleaning Systems [TX95–1–7379a FRL–6104–2] received June 2, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

9473. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Petroleum Refineries [AD-FRL–6106–4] (RIN: 2060–A100) received June 2, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

9474. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources and Guidelines for Control of Existing Sources: Municipal Solid Waste Landfills [AD-FRL–6106–8] received June 2, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

9475. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Indiana [IN82–2; FRL–6013–5] received June 4, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

9476. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval of Colorado's Petition to Relax the Federal Gasoline REID Vapor Pressure Volatility Standard for 1998, 1999, and 2000 [FRL–6106–6] received June 4, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

9477. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Glyphosate; Extension of Tolerance for Emergency Exemptions [OPP–300652; FRL 5788–4] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received June 4, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

9478. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Parts 2, 15, 18 and Other Parts of the Commission's Rules to Simplify and Streamline the Equipment Authorization Process for Radio Frequency Equipment [ET Docket No. 97–94] received June 4, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

9479. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Pima, Arizona) [MM Docket No. 97–228 RM–9163] received June 4, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

9480. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Coon Valley and Westby, Wisconsin and Lanesboro, Minnesota) [MM Docket No. 97–169 RM–9121 RM–9170] received June 4, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

9481. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (McMillan and Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan) [MM Docket No. 97–222 RM–9180 RM–9214] received June 4, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

9482. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Update of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's Fees Schedule for Annual Charges for the Use of Government Lands [Docket No. RM86–2–000] received May 29, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

9483. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Access Authorization Fee Schedule for Licensee Personnel (RIN: 3150–AF90) received May 18, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

9484. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Requirements for Shipping Packages Used to Transport Vitrified High-Level Waste (RIN: 3150–AF59) received May 29, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

9485. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Self-Guarantee of Decommissioning Funding by Nonprofit and Non-BOND–Issuing Licensees (RIN: 3150–AF64) received June 4, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

9486. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the bimonthly report on progress toward a negotiated settlement of the Cyprus question, including any relevant reports from the Secretary General of the United Nations, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2373(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

9487. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Burmese Sanctions Regulations [31 CFR Part 537] received May 19, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

9488. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the proposed obligation to implement the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) Program, pursuant to Public Law 105—56; to the Committee on International Relations.

9489. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 1997 through March 31, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

9490. A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 1997, through March 31, 1998, and the Management Report for the same period, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

9491. A letter from the Chief Executive Officer, Corporation For National Service, transmitting the report from the Acting Inspector General covering the activities of his office for the period of October 1, 1997—March 31, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

9492. A letter from the Director, Office of Rulemaking Coordination, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Determinations and documentation Management controls [FAR Subpart 9.104, 9.105 DEAR Subpart 970.09] received May 21, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

9493. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the eighteenth annual report on final audit action by the Inspector General Act Amendments of 1988, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

9494. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the Inspector General for the period of October 1, 1997, through March 31, 1998, and the Management Response for the same period, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

9495. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Sea Grant Industry Fellows Program [Docket No. 980427105–8105–01] (RIN: 0648–ZA41) received May 18, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9496. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the annual report entitled the ''Northeast Multispecies Harvest Capacity and Impact of Northeast Fishing Capacity Reduction,'' pursuant to Public Law 99—177; to the Committee on Resources.

9497. A letter from the Executive Director, American Chemical Society, transmitting the Society's annual report for the calendar year 1997 and the comprehensive report to the Board of Directors of the American Chemical Society on the examination of their books and records for the year ending December 31, 1997, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 1101(2) and 1103; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9498. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule—Adjustment of Status for Certain Nationals of Nicaragua and Cuba [INS No. 1893–97; AG Order No. 2154–98] (RIN: 1115–AF04) received June 2, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9499. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule—Procedures for the Detention and Release of Criminal Aliens by the Immigration and Naturalization Service and for Custody Redeterminations by the Executive Office for Immigration Review [INS No. 1855–97; AG Order No. 2152–98] (RIN: 1115–AE88) received June 2, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9500. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the 1995 Annual Report to Congress on the State of Fair Housing in America, the racial and ethnic composition of participants in HUD programs and the enforcement efforts of the Fair Housing Initiatives Program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9501. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Saab Model SAAB 340B and SAAB 2000 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 97–NM–134–AD; Amendment 39–10551; AD 98–11–26] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 4, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801 (a) (1) (A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9502. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; de Havilland Model DHC–8–311 and -315 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98–NM–60–AD; Amendment 39–1550; AD 98–11–25] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 4, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9503. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; Porterville, CA [Airspace Docket No. 98–AWP–2] received June 4, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9504. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting Safety Zone: Macy's Fourth of July Fireworks, East River, New York [CGD01–98–014] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received June 4, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9505. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Hazardous Materials Ticketing Program [Notice No. 98–5] received June 4, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9506. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Allison Engine Company AE 3007A and AE 3007C Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 97–ANE–60–AD; Amendment 39–10557, AD 98–11–32] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 4, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9507. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Construcciones Aeronauticas, S.A. (CASA) Model CN–235 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 97–NM–43–AD; Amendment 39–10548; AD 98–11–23] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 4, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9508. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace Model BAe Avro 146–RJ Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98–NM–43–AD; Amendment 39–10553; AD 98–11–28] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 4, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9509. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Dornier Model 328–100 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98–NM–46–AD; Amendment 39–10552; AD 98–11–27] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 4, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9510. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace Model BAe 146 Series Airplanes and Model Avro 146–RJ Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98–NM–52–AD; Amendment 39–10554; AD 98–11–29] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 4, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9511. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A320–111 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98–NM–22–AD; Amendment 39–10410; AD 98–12–05] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 4, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9512. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; de Havilland Model DHC–8–102, -103, and -301 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 96–NM–58–AD; Amendment 39–10546; AD 98–11–21 (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 4, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9513. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Short Brothers Model SD3–60 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98–NM–32–AD; Amendment 39–10547; AD 98–11–22] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 4, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9514. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment of Class E Airspace; Cedar City, UT [Airspace Docket No. 97–ANM–21] received June 4, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9515. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment of Class E Airspace; Cortez, CO [Airspace Docket No. 98–ANM–02] received June 4, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9516. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class D and Establishment of Class E Airspace; Yuma MCAS-Yuma International Airport, AZ [Airspace Docket No. 98–AWP–14] received June 4, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9517. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace Jetstream Model 3101 Airplanes [Docket No. 97–CE–100–AD; Amendment 39–10556; AD 98–11–31] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 4, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9518. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Hazardous Materials: Formal Interpretation of Regulations [Notice No. 98–6] received June 4, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9519. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the 1996 National Water Quality Inventory Report, pursuant to 33 U.S.C. 1315(b)(2);

to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9520. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Departmen of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Procedures for the Evaluation of Energy—Related Inventions; Removal of Regulations [Docket No. 970822201–7202–00] received May 18, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

9521. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule—Veterans Education: Increase in Rates Payable for Cooperative Training Under the Montgomery GI Bill—Active Duty (RIN: 2900–AJ10) received May 19, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

9522. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the President's proclamation and memorandum describing the actions taken and the reasons concerning wheat gluten, pursuant to Trade Act of 1974; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9523. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the annual report on the operation of the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Contingency Fund, pursuant to Public Law 104—193 Public Law 105—89; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9524. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance Benefits; Supplemental Security Income for the Aged, Blind, and Disabled; Organization and Procedures; Application of Circuit Court Law (RIN: 0960–AE74) received May 20, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9525. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. International Trade Commission, transmitting the 49th report on the operation of the U.S. trade agreements program during 1997, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2213(b); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9526. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to grant the government of the District of Columbia control over local revenues; jointly to the Committees on Government Reform and Oversight and the Budget.

9527. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to achieve administrative improvements in the Medicare program, and for other purposes; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Commerce.

9528. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a program of grants to facilitate the development of health insurance purchasing cooperatives, and for other purposes; jointly to the Committees on Commerce, Education and the Workforce, and Government Reform and Oversight.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 2411. A bill to provide for a land exchange involving the Cape Cod National Seashore and to extend the authority for the Cape Cod National Seashore Advisory Commission; with an amendment (Rept. 105–568). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. Report entitled "Abuse of Power: The Hardrock Bonding Rule." (Rept. 105–569). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLILEY: Committee on Commerce. H.R. 3849. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish a national policy against Federal and State regulation of Internet access and online services, and to exercise congressional jurisdiction over interstate and foreign commerce by establishing a moratorium on the imposition of exactions that would interfere with the free flow of commerce conducted over the Internet, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 105–570 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

[Omitted from the Record of June 4, 1998]

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the Committees on Commerce, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Government Reform and Oversight discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1778 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[The following action occurred on June 5, 1998]

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the Committee on Agriculture discharged from further consideration. H.R. 3035 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 3849. Referral to the Committees on Ways and Means, the Judiciary, and Rules extended for a period ending not later than June 19, 1998.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of Rule X and clause 4 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. OBEY (for himself and Mr. MATSUI):

H.R. 3998. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to make payments to each State for the operation of a comprehensive health insurance plan ensuring health insurance coverage for individuals and families in the State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FATTAH:

H.R. 3999. A bill to designate the United States Postal Service building located at 5209 Greene Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, as the "David P. Richardson, Jr., Post Office Building; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

H.R. 4000. A bill to designate the United States Postal Service building located at 400 Edgmont Avenue, Chester, Pennsylvania, as the "THOMAS P. Foglietta Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

H.R. 4001. A bill to designate the United States Postal Service building located at 2601 North 16th Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, as the "Roxanne H. Jones Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

H.R. 4002. A bill to designate the United States Postal Service building located at 5300 West Jefferson Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, as the "Freeman Hankins Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

H.R. 4003. A bill to designate the United States Postal Service building located at 2037 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, as the "Max Weiner Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. HAYWORTH:

H.R. 4004. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide assistance to the Casa Malpais National Historic Landmark in Springerville, Arizona, and to establish the Lower East Side Tenement National Historic Site, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. LEACH (for himself, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. BACHUS, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. BAKER, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. WATERS, and Ms. VELAZQUEZ):

H.R. 4005. A bill to amend title 31 of the United States Code to improve methods for preventing financial crimes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HYDE (for himself and Mr. OBERSTAR):

H.R. 4006. A bill to clarify Federal law to prohibit the dispensing or distribution of a controlled substance for the purpose of causing, or assisting in causing, the suicide, or euthanasia, of any individual; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. HORN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. GOSS, Mr. DICKS, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 4007. A bill to amend section 552 of title 5, United States Code, and the National Security Act of 1947 to require disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act regarding certain persons, disclose Nazi war criminal records without impairing any investigation or prosecution conducted by the Department of Justice or certain intelligence matters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and in addition to the Committees on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BARCIA of Michigan:

H.R. 4008. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to permit the exception from the guaranteed issue requirement for coverage offered only through associations to be applied separately to parts of the small group market based upon size of employers; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut (for himself, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. RAMSTAD, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. LAMPSON, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. ETHERIDGE, and Mr. BERRY):

H.R. 4009. A bill to amend part Q of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to encourage the use of school resource officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. REDMOND:

H.R. 4010. A bill to provide that certain Federal property be made available to States for State use before being made available to other entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and in addition to the Committees on National Security, International Relations, Small Business, and Science, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

H.R. 4011. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the diversity immigrant program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEARNS:

H.R. 4012. A bill to guarantee honesty in budgeting; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STUMP:

H.R. 4013. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain administrative sites and to use the proceeds for the acquisition of office sites and the acquisition, construction, or improvement of offices and administrative support buildings for the Conconino National Forest, Kaibab National Forest, Prescott National Forest, and Tonto National Forest in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. COX of California, and Mr. BARR of Georgia):

H.R. 4014. A bill to require that new signs installed on Park Service Lands on or adjacent to the George Washington Memorial Parkway in Northern Virginia, Maryland, the District of Columbia, or elsewhere, directing motorists to Ronald Reagan National Airport must comply with the will of Congress, the President, and the American people by prominently including the full name, ''Ronald Reagan National Airport,'' and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. FORD (for himself, Ms. CARSON, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. FROST, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. SANDLIN):

H. Con. Res. 287. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should take certain actions to address violence in schools in the United States; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. KIM):

H. Res. 459. A resolution commemorating 50 years of relations between the United States and the Republic of Korea; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. WEYGAND:

H. Res. 460. A resolution recognizing the 20th anniversary of the founding of the Vietnam Veterans of America; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

330. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 43 memorializing that Congress is urged to require that the importation of all agricultural products into Hawaii have a designation of country or origin and a certification of inspection based on United States Department of Agriculture standards to verify that each imported product has passed all U.S. health and agricultural requirements; to the Committee on Agriculture.

331. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of California, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 65 memorializing the federal Health Care Financing Administration, and the Congress and the President of the United States to preserve the state plan to implement the Healthy Families Program in its current approved form; to the Committee on Commerce.

332. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to Resolution 98–1 memorializing that Congress is urged to enact legislation terminating the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project with no record of decision being approved for the project and to refrain from any further appropriation of money to federal agencies for the project; to the Committee on Resources.

333. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of California, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution Number 66 memorializing that the Legislature of the State of California supports the granting of an official apology and restitution to World War II Japanese Latin American internees pursuant to federal law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII,

Mr. SCHUMER introduced a bill (H.R. 4015) for the relief of Kerantha Poole-Christian; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 7: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 8: Mr. MCKEON and Mr. PACKARD.
H.R. 350: Mr. STRICKLAND.
H.R. 371: Ms. CARSON.
H.R. 953: Ms. STABENOW and Ms. CARSON.
H.R. 979: Mr. HILL, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 1289: Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut.
H.R. 1401: Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri and Mr. JEFFERSON.
H.R. 1450: Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 1628: Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania and Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado.
H.R. 1883: Mr. BENTSEN.
H.R. 1891: Mr. HUTCHINSON.
H.R. 2023: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 2173: Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 2174: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. YATES.
H.R. 2281: Mrs. BONO and Mr. PAXON.
H.R. 2327: Mr. DOOLEY of California.
H.R. 2409: Mr. BLUNT, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. GILMAN, and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 2456: Mr. BOSWELL.
H.R. 2485: Mr. BLUNT.
H.R. 2588: Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 2695: Mr. HILLIARD.
H.R. 2789: Mr. RUSH, Mr. CLAY, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2849: Mr. RUSH, Mr. LAMPSON, Ms. WATERS, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. BALDACCI.
H.R. 2914: Mr. HEFNER.
H.R. 2951: Mr. JENKINS.
H.R. 2955: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. YATES, and Mr. BOEHLERT.
H.R. 3081: Mrs. KELLY and Mr. JACKSON.
H.R. 3176: Mr. BRYANT.
H.R. 3205: Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ.
H.R. 3240: Mr. DELAHUNT and Ms. STABENOW.
H.R. 3247: Mr. KUCINICH, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 3259: Ms. WOOLSEY and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.
H.R. 3267: Mrs. BONO.
H.R. 3290: Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. PALLONE, and Ms. FURSE.
H.R. 3292: Mrs. THURMAN.
H.R. 3547: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.
H.R. 3567: Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. ROTHMAN, and Mr. COSTELLO.
H.R. 3629: Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. SALMON, Mr. COOKSEY, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 3632: Mr. NETHERCUTT, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. FARR of California, and Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 3651: Mrs. KELLY, Mr. SANDLIN, and Mr. STOKES.
H.R. 3662: Mr. YATES, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. KANJORSKI, and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 3684: Mr. GILLMOR.
H.R. 3688: Mr. JEFFERSON.
H.R. 3731: Mr. BLILEY, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. WOLF, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. FROST, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. STOKES, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado.
H.R. 3788: Mr. CHRISTENSEN and Mr. POMEROY.
H.R. 3789: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 3802: Mr. TORRES and Ms. RIVERS.
H.R. 3807: Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. BOB SCHAFFER, of Colorado, Mr. SUNUNU, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 3820: Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 3821: Mrs. MYRICK, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. SOUDER, Ms. CARSON, and Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 3858: Ms. GRANGER and Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.
H.R. 3870: Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. PITTS, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. PAUL, Mr. COOK, Mr. WELLER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. WATKINS.
H.R. 3875: Mr. MARTINEZ and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 3881: Mr. DAVIS of Florida.
H.R. 3892: Mr. STUMP and Mr. NORWOOD.
H.R. 3918: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. LUTHER.
H.R. 3949: Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mrs. CUBIN, and Mr. STENHOLM.
H.R. 3966: Mr. BOSWELL.
H.R. 3975: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma and Mr. OXLEY.
H.R. 3980: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FOSSELLA, and Ms. CARSON.
H.R. 3995: Mr. RANGEL.
H. Con. Res. 203: Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado, and Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington.

H. Con. Res. 258: Mr. RUSH, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. GREENWOOD.

H. Con. Res. 278: Mr. HALL of Texas and Mr. BOB SCHAFFER.

H. Con. Res. 281: Mrs. MORELLA.

H. Res. 37: Mr. MENENDEZ and Ms. CARSON.

H. Res. 444: Ms. CARSON and Mr. FROST.

H. Res. 451: Mr. WELLER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. PORTER, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. EWING, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. RUSH.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1054: Mr. SPRATT.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS— ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 1 by Mr. YATES on House Resolution 141: Owen B. Pickett, David E. Skaggs, Danny K. Davis, Bill Luther.